

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the third congressional district of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of sundry citizens of Blue Bush, Clinton Corners, Bangall, Stamfordville, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and sundry citizens of Circleville, all in the State of New York, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Journeymen Barbers' Union, No. 332, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POU: Petition of 26 citizens of North Carolina, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of the Lick Creek General Baptist Church and 24 citizens of Lick Creek, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of Jacksonville, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Meriden, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPLEY: Memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against bills to regulate interstate business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the United Societies for Local Self-Government of Chicago, Ill., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Carlisle, Pa., protesting against passage of the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Erie (Pa.) Foundrymen's Association, relative to extending time for considering bills to regulate interstate business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Carlisle, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 12928, retaining section 6, relative to Sunday work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 58, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of Klowa County Grange, No. 206, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring passage of the Bathrick farm credit bill (H. R. 11897); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of La Junta, Colo., protesting against passage of the Sunday-observance bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELLS: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic Post of Greenville, Tenn., protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of the Spanish War Veterans of Beatrice, Nebr., favoring monthly payment of pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Civil War Veterans of Beatrice, Nebr., favoring monthly payment of pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: Petitions of sundry citizens of Savage, Langham, Springfield, Bowie, Annapolis, Baltimore, Eastport, and Howard County, Md., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: Petitions of 100 citizens of Wayne, 1,100 citizens of Fremont, and 400 citizens of Central City, Nebr., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire: Petitions and protests of Fred S. Crawford and sundry citizens of Woodsville, Manchester, and Benton; N. M. Nutte and sundry citizens of Woodsville, Bath, and Lancaster; 47 citizens of Keene; 107 citizens of Concord; Berlin Central Labor Union; 38 citizens of Hillsboro; 464 citizens of Nashua; 49 citizens of Franklin, all in the State of New Hampshire, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Congregational Church of North Weare; the St. James Protestant Episcopal Church, the Unitarian Congregational, the First Baptist, the Grace Methodist Episcopal, the First Congregational, and the Court Street Congregational Churches of Keene; and Congregational Church of Acworth, all in the State of New Hampshire, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Cranford and Chatham, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Essex County Bankers' Association, of New Jersey, relative to bill No. 15657; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Plainfield, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various voters of the fifth congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of sundry citizens of Elmira and Elmira Heights; the Horseheads Methodist Protestant Church, of Arkport; sundry citizens of Ithaca; 1,421 citizens of Hornell; and 150 citizens of Wayne Village, all in the State of New York, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, approving stand taken by the President relative to Mexican situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 50 voters of the thirty-seventh New York congressional district, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petitions of various residents of Amsterdam, N. Y., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various members of the Schenectady (N. Y.) Typographical Union, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 927, making lawful certain agreements, limiting injunctions, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of John Buehrle, of Bellefontaine, Ohio, protesting against the adoption of House joint resolution No. 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 8, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thee in prayer that we may faithfully and well discharge the duties of this day. May we be enabled to establish and make permanent that which is true, change that which is false, and bring all facts and all ideals to the measurement of Thine own divine will as revealed to us in Thy Word. May we get Thy point of view, and as stewards of God discharge the duties which are upon us. Above all things, may we have the charm and blessing not only of fellow citizenship but of brothers in a common cause, working in the interests of humanity for the glory of God's Name. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 263) designating the second Sunday in May as Mothers' Day, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 14034) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 5445. An act for the relief of Gordon W. Nelson;

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to foreign governments to participate in the International Congress of Americanists; and

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution authorizing the Vocational Education Commission to employ such stenographic and clerical assistants as may be necessary, etc.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of sundry citizens of McKean, New Castle, Pittsburgh, and Verona, in the State of Pennsylvania; of New York City, N. Y.; of Rockford and Marietta, in the State of Ohio; of Cloquet, Minn.; and of

Wheeling, W. Va., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that a telegram which I send to the desk may be read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

[Telegram.]

PORTSMOUTH, N. H., May 7, 1914.

HON. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Please oppose HOBSON'S proposed prohibition amendment to the Constitution, as it will confiscate great wealth and throw many people out of employment.

HARRY ROSE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have also telegrams of a similar nature, all from Portsmouth, N. H., from George Klump, Charles Ingram, Seth Hanson, Joseph Hassett, Charles Eastman, Harry Wendell, George French, R. L. Costello, J. G. Parsons, Clifford W. Bass, Albert Tilton, Thomas Parsons, John Leary, Valentine Sett, August F. Neschke, Charles E. Johnson, C. H. R. Woodward, Frederick Drew, Arthur Freeman, D. J. Tracy, Fred Gray, Dr. M. A. Higgins, John Kilroe, James Whitman, James Harvey, George Murray, and Norman Beane, remonstrating against national prohibition.

I have also memorials opposing the proposed constitutional amendment for national prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors signed by 1,647 citizens of Manchester, 102 citizens of Concord, 400 citizens of Nashua, 36 citizens of Walpole, 36 citizens of Hillsborough, 131 citizens of Somersworth, and 24 citizens of Rockingham and Strafford Counties, all in the State of New Hampshire.

I ask that the telegrams and memorials may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of A. H. Thayer, of Monadnock, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation making a liberal appropriation for the enforcement of the so-called migratory-bird law, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Concord Lodge, No. 537, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Concord, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a literacy test for immigrants to this country, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Prescott, Ark., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present resolutions adopted at the sixth biennial convention of the Texas legislative boards and committees of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, Order of Railway Conductors, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, and Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, held at Fort Worth, Tex., April 18, 1914, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the dumping of more than a million of immigrants into this country annually is proving a menace to American institutions, the American home, and the American laborer, and the resulting competition with the working people of our land is causing bitterness and even anarchy in our industrial life; and

Whereas it has been well said that "charity begins at home," and while the United States has opened its gates to the earth's millions and offered an asylum to the oppressed and a home for the unfortunate, still this great country has no right to carry its hospitality one step over the line where American institutions and American workmen and the American standard of wages and living are brought into serious peril; and

Whereas the National House of Representatives has passed the Burnett bill (H. R. 6060), containing a literacy test and other provisions which we believe will properly restrict immigration into this country, and will repeal the inadequate and farcical law now on the statute books relating to this subject: Therefore be it

Resolved by the sixth biennial convention of the Texas legislative boards and committees of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, Order of Railway Conductors, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, and Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, at Fort Worth, Tex., April 18, 1914, That we respectfully ask our United States Senators and the President of the United States, Hon. Woodrow Wilson, to complete the enactment of this just and greatly needed measure.

Mr. GRONNA. I present petitions signed by a large number of citizens of Manfred, Stanley, Fargo, Park River, and Robinson, in the State of North Dakota, praying for the adoption of a national constitutional prohibition amendment. I ask that the petitions may be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a petition signed by 200 citizens of Aneta, N. Dak., which I ask may be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution suggested for adoption by churches, young people's societies, clubs, and other organizations, and by public meetings generally. Woman's Christian Temperance Union speakers are urgently requested to secure from all meetings which they address the adoption of this resolution:

"Resolved, That we are in hearty favor of national constitutional prohibition, and will do all within our power to secure the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution forever prohibiting the sale, manufacture for sale, transportation for sale, importation for sale, and exportation for sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes in the United States, in accordance with the joint resolution introduced in the United States Congress by Congressman RICHMOND PEARSON HOBSON."

Adopted by mass meeting representing 200 people, April 2, 1914.

PEARL KIRK,
Aneta, N. Dak.

Mr. CHILTON presented the petition of J. M. Mason, of Charles Town, W. Va., praying for payment of damages caused to him by a preliminary injunction obtained by the United States under a mistake of facts, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GRONNA presented an affidavit in support of the bill (S. 5281) for the relief of Wiley W. Houston, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WORKS presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of Martinez, Cal., and a petition of sundry citizens of Oakland, Cal., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Joseph Grinnell, Harold C. Dryant, and F. Martens, of the University of California, Berkeley, Cal., praying for a peaceful settlement of the difficulties between this country and Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a memorial of the Trades Council of Everett, Wash., remonstrating against the conditions existing in the mining districts of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions signed by members of the Young People's Christian Union of the Monongahela Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, residing within the counties of Allegheny and Washington, and of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry unions of the United Mine Workers of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation into the conditions existing in the mining districts of Colorado, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Chester, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for Government ownership of the telephone and telegraph systems, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of 2,600 citizens of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CRAWFORD presented petitions of the Epworth League of Elk Point, of the Sunday School of Athol, and of sundry citizens of White, all in the State of South Dakota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Corinth and East Hebron, in the State of Maine, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NORRIS presented a petition of the Nebraska Church Federation, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented memorials of sundry citizens of California, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Con-

stitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Stafford, Conn., and of Union Grange, No. 25, Patrons of Husbandry, of Milldale, Conn., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BRYAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 11040. A bill to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James Harvey Dennis (Rept. No. 496); and

H. R. 11381. A bill for the relief of the estate of T. J. Semmes, deceased (Rept. No. 495).

Mr. LEA of Tennessee, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2472) to correct the military record of Herman von Werthern, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 497) thereon.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 819) providing for the homestead entry of certain lands in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 499) thereon.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (S. 4946) to establish an additional fish-cultural station in the State of Texas, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 498) thereon.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1758. A bill for the relief of Warren E. Day (Rept. No. 500); and

S. 2661. A bill for the relief of the administrator and heirs of John G. Campbell, to permit the prosecution of Indian depredation claims (Rept. No. 501).

MEMORIAL EXERCISES, BROOKLYN NAVY YARD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably without amendment House concurrent resolution No. 39, providing for the representation of the Congress at the exercises to be held at the navy yard in Brooklyn, N. Y., and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That for the representation of the Congress at the exercises to be held at the navy yard in Brooklyn, N. Y., on Monday, May 11, 1914, in honor of the men of the Navy and Marine Corps who lost their lives at Vera Cruz, Mexico, there shall be appointed by the Vice President 7 Members of the United States Senate and by the Speaker 21 Members of the House of Representatives.

"Sec. 2 That the expenses of the committee shall be defrayed in equal parts from the contingent appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives."

ON THE RETURN OF THE DEAD SAILORS AND MARINES WHO FELL IN MEXICO AND RESOLUTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE OF SENATE AND HOUSE TO ATTEND CEREMONIES IN NEW YORK.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, on yesterday afternoon my attention was attracted to a concurrent resolution brought into the Senate, having passed the House, requesting the appointment of Members of this body to accompany Members of the other House to attend the ceremonies incident upon the arrival of the ship bearing the bodies of the American seamen. The resolution is now reported for passage. I am sure that I lay no vain flattery to myself if I assume that in what I now purpose to say I speak for every Senator who is honored with a place in this Chamber. This morning there comes a favorable report upon that resolution.

Mr. President, the news of the hour brings us the intelligence that a United States warship is solemnly bearing to our shores the Nation's dead, who died at the command of duty in Mexico.

Mr. President, these men were of the many who from humble places in life's assignment stepped forth to dedicate their lives to their country's need. No sordid pursuit of money for riches' sake blighted their usefulness. No selfish purpose to prosper upon the sacrifice of others possessed their dreams. No undertaking promising ease, exempt from burdens, was their aspiration. No. These heard their country's trumpet calling for valiant sons to protect and defend their common mother. From

the farm they leaped to obedience. From the workshop they came with hands outstretched for service. From humble and obscure homes each joyously went his way to dedicate his young life to the destiny of America. With a father's blessing and a mother's parting kiss, with a "God bless you, my boy," they came. No riches softened their lot. No birth gave them privilege. Their endowment was the consolation that their honest lives were worthy the love of those left behind them and their inspiration in the hope that their service might earn the approval of their countrymen.

In loftiness of soul but in humility of duty they consecrated their lives to the honor of their flag and to the glory of their Nation. At the command they stepped out and forward, then, with face to the foe, fell in death.

Behold them, the four who were the first to fall completing the ever-present mystic square, personifying the all: Daniel Haggerty, an Irishman, a descendant of those who marched with Patrick Cleburne from the South and Phil Sheridan from the North; John Schumacher, the German, the offspring of those who fought for us under Steuben; George Poinsett, of the race of those who marched with Lafayette; and then Samuel Meisenberg, the Jew, the child of a people without a country, but now a son claimed by a nation.

Mr. President, as the stately ship bearing their silent forms turned toward the motherland she was saluted by the dipped colors of the greatest nations of the world. This was the homage which power and glory ever pays to the high purposes and sublime uses of heroic lives. Nor monarchs nor captains ever had nobler tribute in death than these humble and valiant dead. The salutations of the powerful of earth, sanctified by the requiem of the moaning waves and sweetened by the chant of the singing winds, consecrated the grandeur of their sublime homecoming.

Now, sir, they are to be met on their own native shores by the outpouring of the thousands who will greet them as those who gave honor to American seamen and victory to American arms.

The President of the United States, the officers of the Cabinet, Members of Congress, and the officials of honor in every avenue of distinction all will assemble to receive these returning children of their proud mother. They are taken to the heart of their countrymen in tears, to remain revered by their Nation. Surely it is sweet and noble to die for one's country.

Now, sir, I as an American present this exhibition of the world's testimonial to these beloved sons as an answer to those who by false accusation demean patriotic defense of the flag and condemn as servile those who engage for the protection of the Republic. I present this majestic march of the Nation's mourners against the false assertions that to enlist for the Army of America is degradation and to fight for the country's honor is a service rewarded only with contempt. I present this array of historic tribute to refute the calumny sent about by those who would desert their country in its peril and sacrifice it in its danger as they perpetrate the slander upon our patriotism that to die for America is but to be ignored in rewards and buried in forgetfulness. Sir, as against the attempt to slay the ardor of the young and to cheat the Nation of the protection by her manhood through maligning the spirit of American valor and falsifying the gratitude of the American people I present these proofs of the Nation's sublime affection for her sons, and I tender the presentation of these glorifying honors paid to their memory and renown.

Mr. President, we summon the watching world to attest to mankind the attachment of America for her children and to witness the tribute and triumph she pays to the hero, however lowly, who serves her cause.

So to-day from the Senate we send to the sad ones who await their beloved dead our sympathy and sorrow, as we certify to civilization that these who have fallen fulfilled the complete measure of man—THEY LIVED FOR DUTY, GAVE SERVICE TO GOD, AND DIED FOR COUNTRY. May their souls rest in heaven.

MEMORIAL EXERCISES, BROOKLYN NAVY YARD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In compliance with the provisions of House concurrent resolution No. 39, the Chair appoints Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. O'GORMAN, Mr. VARDAMAN, Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. KENTON, and Mr. BRADY as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the exercises to be held in Brooklyn, N. Y., May 11, 1914, in honor of the men of the Navy and Marine Corps who lost their lives at Vera Cruz, Mexico.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHERS.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 350, submitted by Mr. O'GORMAN on the 6th

instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the provisions of resolution of April 6, 1914, authorizing the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals to employ temporarily a stenographer, be extended for 30 days from the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By direction of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably Senate resolution 348, submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on the 4th instant. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. I will state, in explanation, that this is rather emergent, and it is for that reason I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia be, and hereby is, authorized to employ an additional stenographer, at the rate of \$100 a month, the term of services of such stenographer to conclude two weeks after the final adjournment of the second session Sixty-third Congress.

SOUTHERN COALING STATION FOR NAVY.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By direction of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, with amendments, Senate resolution 291, and I call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. As I understand, the resolution includes all the ports on the Atlantic from Norfolk to Jacksonville?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not object, of course, to having the resolution read, but it involves a very important matter, and I should like to reserve the right to object to its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment reported by the committee.

The SECRETARY. As reported originally from the Committee on Naval Affairs, all the text of the resolution was stricken out and the following inserted:

Whereas in view of the early completion of the Isthmian Canal and of its importance to the United States Navy and the national defense generally, and to the development of trade with Central and South American countries, the establishment of adequate coal-supplying facilities south of Cape Hatteras is deemed imperative; and

Whereas the usefulness and efficiency of any harbor as a coaling station must depend upon the facilities (first) of the coal producers for reaching it and (second) of the coal carriers in the matter of assembling the product at said port, including coal docks and other facilities for loading and handling, which should be accessible to all shippers and carriers alike on the same terms and conditions; and

Whereas it appears from numerous complaints now before the Interstate Commerce Commission, as well as from other sources, that the power and influence of the so-called Coal Trust is being persistently used through the management of the railroads reaching South Atlantic ports to prevent the free movement of coal not belonging to said Coal Trust, and it is alleged that practically all of such roads are actually dominated by the same financial interests that control the great coal combines finding outlet chiefly through New York Harbor, Philadelphia, and the Chesapeake Bay ports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be, and it is hereby, authorized and instructed to investigate the natural and strategic advantages for naval purposes of ports south of Hatteras as compared with Norfolk and other Chesapeake Bay ports as a permanent point for coal distribution, and included and embraced in the scope of said investigation the said committee is further authorized and instructed to investigate into the character and proximity of the coal supply, and the rates obtainable on coal from the coal fields near by; and the committee is further instructed to ascertain as far as it is practicable—

First, What quantity of bituminous coal is consumed or used at Charleston, Savannah, Brunswick, Fernandina, and Jacksonville, and in their vicinities, and what proportion of this coal is supplied from mines located on the Pennsylvania Railroad system, including the Baltimore & Ohio, Norfolk & Western, and Chesapeake & Ohio, and what proportion is supplied by mines on the Southern Railway.

Second, Whether the United States Navy, including the naval stations, now pays a higher freight rate for coal supply at any or all Atlantic seaports than is charged to commercial ships for bunkering or for coastwise distribution; and whether all coal for naval supply, at the Atlantic seaports, is not supplied by the so-called Coal Trust; that is, by the mines that have a common ownership or control with the coal carriers; and whether present conditions prevent competitive bidding for the United States Navy coal supply, or any part thereof, by independent coal operators.

Third, The mileage from mine groups located on the Southern Railway in Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama to Wilmington, Charleston, Savannah, Brunswick, Fernandina, and Jacksonville; and the mileage to these same ports, the way the coal is moved from the mines on the Pennsylvania Railroad system and on the Baltimore & Ohio, Norfolk & Western, and Chesapeake & Ohio Railroads and all connecting lines in West Virginia; and in all cases show the freight rates on coals to the cities named, both by rail and rail and water; and where two or more carriers participate, ascertain the proportion of the rate (or service charge) each receives; and also compare these

rates with those at seaport towns and cities from Norfolk to New York for local use, for tidewater shipment, and for naval use.

Fourth, Why the Southern Railway has built no wharves or made no provision for handling tidewater coal at any of the South Atlantic ports, and whether the riparian rights and water frontage of South Atlantic harbors is not now being bought up by the parties in the interest of the Coal Trust, while the Southern Railway is taking no active steps to build for itself an independent outlet.

Fifth, Whether trustees for the stockholders and members of the board of directors of the Southern Railway are financially interested in coal-mining industries on the Pennsylvania Railroad system, the Baltimore & Ohio, the Norfolk & Western, or the Chesapeake & Ohio, and to what extent; and whether they, or any of them, are financially interested in any coal-mining industries tributary to any of said railways. And if found to be interested, ascertain whether such mines have been allowed preference or advantages not allowed to all other shippers (shown by cases already decided by the Interstate Commerce Commission or State commissions). And in all coal-mining operations tributary to the Southern Railway in which any director of the Southern Railway or director of any railroad controlled by it, or allied with the Southern Railway, is financially interested, ascertain the division of through rates with other railroads, and in all cases where a coal operation tributary to the Southern Railway controls a local railroad, or when such local railroad is controlled in common with a coal operation, for assembling and distributing its own coal, ascertain just what proportion of rates it receives, if any, from the carriers, or what compensation other than a division of the rates it may receive.

Sixth, Whether the rate making for the Southern Railway, or other southern carriers of coal, is dominated by the Pennsylvania Railroad or Norfolk & Western; or whether the freight rates of the Southern Railway and any of the other southern coal carriers are made and fixed and maintained by the traffic men of the Southern Railway and other southern carriers; or whether the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Norfolk & Western Railway, the Baltimore & Ohio, and Chesapeake & Ohio, exercise any influence either through a rate-making or traffic association or otherwise, in the matter of making the rates for the Southern Railway and other southern carriers.

Seventh, Whether or not there is any discrimination now existing in favor of any one port on the Atlantic seaboard as against another port, and, if so, in what does such discrimination consist; and whether or not any coal trust or combination of railroads and coal companies control the coal tonnage to any port or ports, and, if so, how; and whether or not the coal supply of West Virginia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Kentucky flows naturally and without unnecessary obstruction to their respective natural ports upon the Atlantic seaboard; and whether or not there is any discrimination in rates against any coal operators.

Eighth, The coal rates to thirty or more representative cities on the Southern Railway in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, and compare these rates with the rates enjoyed by the cities of relative importance and location, with regard to mines, in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan on the Pennsylvania Railroad system, including the cities whose rates are compared in the letter read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator TILLMAN on April 8.

Ninth, What actual ownership each director of the Southern Railway Co. has in that company, and what ownership, if any, is held in it by the individuals composing the trustees for the stockholders.

Said Committee on Naval Affairs is authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of Congress, and its hearings shall be open to the public, and it is authorized and empowered to employ counsel, coal experts, railroad-rate experts, and such other clerical and stenographic and expert assistants as it may deem necessary. Said committee shall have power to compel witnesses to testify, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths to witnesses, and do anything necessary to arrive at all the facts.

The expenses incident to the investigation herein authorized, not to exceed \$10,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The said Committee on Naval Affairs may, in its discretion, conduct this investigation by a subcommittee of not less than five members, to be appointed by the chairman, and shall make its report as soon as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the amendments first be read as reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendments to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 4, after the word "employ," to strike out the word "counsel"; in lines 5 and 6, to strike out the words "such other clerical and stenographic and expert assistants as it may deem necessary" and insert "to employ a stenographer at a price not to exceed one dollar per printed page"; in line 11, before the word "exceed," to strike out the words "not to" and insert "shall not"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HENRY LA ROQUE.

Mr. CLAPP. A few days ago there was received from the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 14229) for the relief of Henry La Roque, and it was inadvertently referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It is merely to give the man the

right to an appeal, and it clearly ought to go to the Committee on Indian Affairs. I would ask the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the acting chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, to have that committee discharged from its further consideration, and to have the bill referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, where it properly belongs. I think there can be no objection to that course.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTHER'S DAY.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 263) designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day was read twice by its title.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be immediately considered and put on its passage. It authorizes the President to proclaim the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day throughout the United States, and it will have to be passed this morning if at all.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will have it referred to the committee now, it can be reported right back, before the close of the day, and have unanimous consent granted for its consideration. I think that is the proper way.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the Senator prefers me to take that course, I will do so. Does the Senator think that I may poll the committee on the floor?

Mr. SMOOT. There is not any question about it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well. Let the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia subsequently said: From the Committee on Education and Labor I report back with an amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 263) designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I have secured the signatures of a majority of the Committee on Education and Labor in behalf of the joint resolution which was received from the House of Representatives this morning, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Education and Labor was, in section 2, page 2, line 5, before the words "its observance," to strike out "require" and insert "request," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Whereas the service rendered the United States by the American mother is the greatest source of the country's strength and inspiration; and Whereas we honor ourselves and the mothers of America when we do anything to give emphasis to the home as the fountainhead of the State; and

Whereas the American mother is doing so much for the home, the moral uplift, and religion, hence so much for good government and humanity: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the Government officials to display the United States flag on all Government buildings, and the people of the United States to display the flag at their homes or other suitable places, on the second Sunday in May, as a public expression of our love and reverence for the mothers of our country.

SEC. 2. That the second Sunday in May shall hereafter be designated and known as Mother's Day, and it shall be the duty of the President to request its observance as provided for in this resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day, and for other purposes."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 5511) for the relief of the heirs of Gaston H. Wilder, deceased (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 5512) granting an increase of pension to Felix M. Wheat; and

A bill (S. 5513) granting a pension to John N. Calvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 5514) granting an increase of pension to Loucette E. Glavis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 5515) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Caribou Board of Trade, in the town of Caribou, State of Maine, one bronze or brass cannon or fieldpiece, with its carriage and cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 5516) granting an increase of pension to Leona B. Hauke (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 5517) to reduce night work in post offices; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) to provide for legally determining the ownership of and title to the fire-alarm system and appliances, apparatus, and connections heretofore placed and installed in the Government buildings of the Government Hospital for the Insane, and to determine such other questions as are provided for in the following resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. OLIVER. I submit an amendment to the Panama Canal tolls bill, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

On page 1, line 10, strike out the word "repealed" and insert "amended to read as follows: No tolls shall be levied upon vessels of the United States or of any of the citizens thereof."

Mr. OLIVER. I ask that the amendment may be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

MILL NOTES—BRADFORD'S EXPORTS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have a brief article from the Daily Trade Record of May 2, 1914, in reference to the mill situation in the city of Fall River, Mass., and also a brief article showing the exports from Bradford, England. I ask that the two articles may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Trade Record, May 2, 1914.]

MILL NOTES.

FALL RIVER.

The mill situation: Mills are continuing to report further losses of skilled help and a more extended reduction of production. Idle machinery throughout the mills has been estimated this week at approximately 85 per cent, and it is expected that the enforced curtailment will reach one-fifth of the total production within a short time.

The exodus to outdoor employment has already begun, and it is affecting mostly the weaving department, where the skilled operatives are employed. Yet the treasurers are not apparently disturbed, and in many cases they are even satisfied to shut down a fifth of their machinery. They point out that goods are now piling up, and the idle machinery affords a curtailment that will keep down the accumulation. Conditions for the next few weeks will be watched with keen interest by the treasurers, because of the general feeling that failure to improve will result in a curtailment policy. Such a plan will be taken up only as a last resort, because the mill men realize that the labor shortage is a serious problem here, and every effort is to be made to keep all the skilled help possible in the mills and in the city.

Textile union officials are also viewing the situation with interest, but whatever plans were considered for a renewal of the agitation for a wage increase have been abandoned for a time at least. They realize that conditions do not warrant steps toward an increase in wages, and this matter will probably not be taken up by the textile council until some marked improvement in the trade is apparent.

BRADFORD'S EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES—INCREASE 280 PER CENT.

Writing under date of April 22, the regular Bradford, England, correspondent of the Daily Trade Record says:

"At last the figures relating to the Bradford exports to the United States for March are available. Augustus E. Ingram, the United States consul, explains the lateness of publication by the fact that there has been such a pressure of work in the preparation of the returns, and when one considers that both the total value of the exports and the total increase are easily the highest recorded since the new tariff took effect, one is compelled to admit that the consul has ample excuse for a few days' delay.

"The total value is £634,391, and the total increase over March of last year £470,238; in other words, an increase of over 280 per cent. The chief rise in the total is due to America's increased purchases of colonial and foreign wool, amounting to some £218,258 in value, and larger than the January and February exports of this description combined. The increase in this case is £185,192, or about 520 per cent; but English wools only show an increase of some £35,882, the total being £52,802.

"So much for the raw material. Tops have been sent out valued at £24,343, compared with none at all last March. In February the total was about £27,000. Nails and wastes are declared at £23,116, showing an increase of £21,825. It thus appears that England and the States are exchanging their nolls. Worsteds and mohair yarns (worsted, £21,704; mohair, £8,804) show a combined increase of £26,206, and about £13,000 worth of these yarns has been exported than in February. Completion of the season's deliveries is given as the reason for lower values of stuffs (dress goods, £43,654; linings, £60,075), but worsteds seem to be affected very slightly by the season, as they have been about £40,000 value during the last three months.

"MARCH EXPORTS.

"The exports to the United States during last March, outside of those previously published in this paper, are:

Articles.	March, 1914.	March, 1913.
Cotton cloths:		
Dress goods.....	£18,116	£9,952
Linings.....	41,094	12,640
Yarns:		
Silk.....	17,733	16,026
Cotton.....	4,324	4,708
Wool tops.....	24,343	
Wool nolls and waste.....	23,116	1,290
Silk nolls and waste.....	13,057	1,062
Sheepskins, packed.....	2,781	6,444
Carpets and rugs.....	1,803	2,167
Hair:		
Mohair goat.....	978	3,212
Alpacas.....	148	
Hair cloths.....	728	87
Silk goods:		
Silk and silk and cotton piece goods.....	177	36
Silk seals, plushes, etc.....	414	98
Tapestry, damasks, etc.....	422	651
Total.....	634,391	164,152

"QUARTERLY RETURNS.

"It is interesting, also, to note the quarterly returns. The total is £1,739,286, which is easily £1,000,000 more than in 1913 or 1912, whose totals, respectively, were £540,871 and £696,315. In the quarterly returns the attitude of the American wool trade is clearly reflected. Tops, yarns, and pieces are going out, but the figures for wool overwhelm them all (£628,392). It is another indication that the new tariff has worked wonders in the Bradford trade."

ADDRESS BY EX-GOV. W. A. M'CORKLE.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask to have printed as a public document an address by ex-Gov. W. A. MacCorkle before the West Virginia Coal Mining Institute, at Charleston, W. Va., December 8, 1913, on the relation of West Virginia coals to the Panama Canal. I ask that the copy of the address, which I have, may be referred to the Committee on Printing, for the purpose of having it printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

FRUIT EXPORTATION.

Mr. CHILTON. I present a communication from William Campbell, of Charles Town, W. Va., secretary and manager of The Virginias Fruit Exchange, transmitting resolutions adopted at the last meeting of the Eastern Fruit Growers' Association. I ask that the communication and accompanying resolutions may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the communication and accompanying resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE VIRGINIAS FRUIT EXCHANGE,
Charles Town, W. Va., April 27, 1914.

Hon. WILLIAM E. CHILTON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed I hand you a communication which I would like you to have read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in its entirety as soon as you conveniently can. Thanking you, I am,

Faithfully, yours,

WM. CAMPBELL.

THE VIRGINIAS FRUIT EXCHANGE.

Charles Town, W. Va., April 27, 1914.

Hon. WILLIAM E. CHILTON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to communicate the following excerpt from the minutes of the last meeting of the Eastern Fruit Growers' Association:

"Resolution offered by William Campbell, of Charles Town, W. Va., manager of The Virginias Fruit Exchange.

"Whereas the fruit planted acreage of the United States has been very largely increased within the past few years; and

"Whereas the orchards and groves which are beginning to come into bearing will increase the fruit output of the country to an extent which renders it both desirable and necessary that new outlets be found for the increased production; and

"Whereas the opening of the Panama Canal and improved trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific steamship transportation offer great possibilities for the export of American fruits under quick transit and adequate refrigeration facilities, not only to South American, but to European, Asiatic, Australian, and African markets at present unavailable to the fruit growers of the United States: Be it

"Resolved, That we commend the efforts of the administration to extend our foreign commerce under the plans now being formulated, and respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to provide such fair and liberal appropriations as may be necessary for the accomplishment of that purpose.

"Indorsed by Eastern Fruit Growers' Association at meeting January 6, 1914.

"THOMAS B. SYMONS,

"Secretary."

The resolutions are self-explanatory and indicative of the attitude of eastern fruit growers toward the efforts of the Government to increase the exportation of their product.

Kindly make such disposition of this report as may be helpful in the premises, and oblige,

Yours, very truly,

WM. CAMPBELL, Secretary.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Tuesday, May 12, following the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate on the Panama Canal tolls question.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 14034. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I ask to have the canal tolls bill laid before the Senate in order that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] may address the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14385) to amend section 5 of "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hollis	Norris	Smith, Md.
Borah	Hughes	O'Gorman	Smoot
Brady	James	Oliver	Sterling
Bristow	Johnson	Overman	Sutherland
Bryan	Kenyon	Page	Swanson
Burleigh	La Follette	Perkins	Thomas
Chamberlain	Lane	Pomerene	Thompson
Chilton	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Root	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Lewis	Saulsbury	Walsh
Crawford	Lippitt	Shafroth	Warren
Dillingham	Lodge	Sheppard	Weeks
Gallinger	McCumber	Sherman	West
Goff	McLean	Shively	Williams
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Simmons	
Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. WALSH. I wish to announce that the absence of my colleague [Mr. MYERS] is due to illness.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH] on important business. He is paired on all votes with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire this announcement to stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, we are considering to-day a bill the object of which is to repeal legislation that has had the unqualified approval of the voters of this Nation. The people have fully considered, accurately weighed in the balance the domestic and international question involved, and have by an overwhelming majority—a regular avalanche of ballots—decided that they are not wanting in merit, that the Congress was wise and patriotic when it exempted from tolls our coastwise ships when passing through the Panama Canal.

Our situation as a Nation is most peculiar, altogether anomalous, really distressing, verging even on the pitiful. Like a

mighty vessel upon a stormy sea without a navigator, our Ship of State is drifting, carried along by a political current pregnant with disaster at home and frightful entanglements abroad.

In November, 1912, at a general election held throughout the Nation, 15,034,800 votes were cast, of which Woodrow Wilson received 6,293,120, William H. Taft 3,485,082, Theodore Roosevelt 4,119,588, Eugene V. Debs 901,839, Eugene W. Chafin 206,427, and Arthur E. Reimer 28,750. Of these votes 13,897,784—the Wilson, Taft, and Roosevelt votes—were polled openly, enthusiastically, patriotically, in approval of the act exempting our coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, and I am warranted in saying that the other votes were cast with like intention. In fact, rather marvelous, most unusual, it was 15,034,800 unanimous votes polled in behalf of a great cause—a most unique and inspiring tribute to the loyal sentiment of the Nation.

Diverse and distracted as our citizenship was on other questions of political thought and economic policy, paradoxical as it may seem, the candidate who received 6,293,120 votes, and against whom 8,741,608 votes were cast, was elected, and is now our President. The convention that nominated him adopted a platform containing a plank which declared for free tolls, such declaration receiving the full approval of the candidate.

When the Democratic national convention met in Baltimore and promulgated that platform the situation was different from what it is now, for it was then popular and regarded as a patriotic duty to advocate the exemption from tolls of coastwise vessels. It was not then considered as a subsidy, but as an honest, legitimate effort to aid our merchant marine, and to restore our flag to the seas from which it had been driven. The Democratic Party solemnly pledged its policy and its candidates to the legislation that granted free tolls to coastwise ships. It was not an oversight; it was not a mistake; it was not "just slipped in." It was duly considered and regularly adopted. The distinguished gentlemen who composed that convention, shining lights in the management of that great party into the keeping of which the destinies of this Nation are now confided, are not highly honored by those who now say that when that convention read into its creed the words, "We favor the exemption from tolls of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal," it did not appreciate the importance and magnitude of the matter involved.

It is with pleasure that I note quite a number of those to whom I have just made reference have emphatically repudiated this suggestion. The Democratic convention was right, wonderful as it may seem, when it incorporated those words into its platform. The Democratic candidate for President, speaking in favor of those words, was right; but when he, as President, says to the Congress in substance, that the words are vicious and that the provision should be ungrudgingly repealed, he is everlastingly wrong.

If the convention promises then so made are now to be disregarded, what confidence will the people have in the plighted faith of party platforms? In plain words, Mr. President, if they were made to be disregarded at will, if party platforms are not now binding as once they were, then our system of government for the people and by the people has received such a blow that it will require the adoption of other rules, of better methods, before the voters will again trust those who have so deceived them.

Mr. President, let me call attention to what some of our Democratic friends, some of them Members of the Senate, all of them men of character and well-earned renown, have said concerning this plank in their platform. I read from statements purporting to come directly from them, published in reputable journals, and, so far as I am advised, no one has denied or corrected them.

I find in the New York Evening Journal, March 30, 1914, the following interview with Senator J. K. VARDAMAN. I regret he is absent.

Senator J. K. VARDAMAN, of Mississippi, member of the Democratic platform committee at the Baltimore convention, made this statement in connection with the fight for free tolls:

"I have no more respect for the integrity of a man who will violate a pledge made in the performance of a public duty than I have for a man who accepts a bribe to control his official conduct."

"I agree with Mr. Bryan that a certain man who would win office on a platform and then violate it is an embezzler of power and guilty of a crime of as great moral turpitude as a soldier who would betray his country in time of war."

"When the question of repealing the law permitting American ships engaged in the coastwise trade to pass through the canal free of tolls came up I was curious to know what the President was going to say in explanation of his change of front. I thought he would take the Congress into his confidence and that we would reason together about this matter."

"But when he simply said that we should do this because he asked us to do it, and do it ungrudgingly, I thought that message an affront to the intelligence and patriotism of every Member of Congress."

I see the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] now honors me with his presence, and if this publication is not correct I beg that he will advise me.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not know what the Senator reads.

Mr. GOFF. I read from what purports to be a statement of yours made March 30, published in the New York Evening Journal.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I did not hear the article. Will the Senator state what it is?

Mr. GOFF. I am reading it now.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I will listen to the Senator.

Mr. GOFF. I have already read a portion of it, which I will hand the Senator.

"It reminded me"—

Still quoting from my brother Senator—

"It reminded me of the schoolmaster who tells his pupils to go to their classroom, ask no questions, but leave the matter to the superior intelligence and patriotism of the professor."

"I was a member of the platform committee of the Baltimore convention"—

Pardon me for a moment when I say that I think the entire statement is an admirable one.

"This canal-toll question was considered carefully, and it was as much the mature judgment of the convention as any other plank in the platform."

"After the convention the President approved it. Mr. Bryan approved it. The American people approved it."

"Now, to ask Democrats elected on that platform to betray their constituents and violate instructions given by them in their votes at the Baltimore convention is asking a little more than my sense of right and loyalty to my constituents will permit me to do."

"It is most unfortunate that this great problem can not be discussed without imputing improper motives to the men who made it possible for Mr. Wilson to be elected President."

"I believe the Government has the right to pass through the canal free of tolls not only our coastwise shipping but our own ships engaged in international commerce. I do not believe free tolls to all American ships would be an injustice to any other nation."

"But I am much more interested in deserving the commendation of my own people than I am in earning the applause of foreign nations by maintaining our reputation for generosity."

"The President's position—"

Still quoting—

"It is absolutely indefensible. The proposition to yield to the dictation of a European power in this matter is humiliating. Rather than violate the pledge I have made to my constituents, I would resign my seat in the Senate. I want to say that it is no justification for the perfidious and sycophantic betrayal of constituents to say that the President advises it. The President is as much the creature of the voter as I am, and he can never rise superior to his creator."

"I dissent emphatically from certain gentlemen that Senators and Representatives are called upon to follow the President. The ideas expressed by the President are accepted by me at their intrinsic value."

"I am not going to criticize Mr. Bryan. His great desire to work in harmony with the President seems to have operated as a kind of hypnotic spell. Instead of the strong voice I expected him to be, he seems to be content to play the part of the echo."

So endeth the chapter.

I quote now from another distinguished Member of the Senate, Senator WALSH, also a delegate to the Baltimore convention, who always is candid, knowing well how to clearly express his views. He is reported in the American Economist of March 6, 1914, in these words:

While I have regarded the transactions within the resolutions committee as more or less confidential, I am willing to give my recollection of the steps by which the free-tolls plank became a part of the Baltimore platform. Recent imputations in the newspapers may tend to create the impression that there was something disingenuous, mysterious, or sinister in respect to the matter. There was not. On the contrary, there was nothing connected with it which affords the slightest foundation for such a charge or suspicion. The plank was offered in the subcommittee of eleven by Senator O'GORMAN. Opinion in its favor seemed so unanimous that there was practically no debate. At the suggestion of Mr. Bryan, ships owned by railroad companies were barred from using the canal, and the fact that this latter suggestion was found in the Baltimore platform, along with the approval of free tolls for coastwise vessels, shows plainly that the subcommittee was fully cognizant of the existence of the free-tolls plank.

These matters—

Still quoting now from Senator WALSH—

along with others, were then referred to a subcommittee of four. The four were Mr. Bryan, Senator POMERENE, Senator O'GORMAN, and myself. We reported back on all the planks now in the Baltimore platform, and I was assigned to put the sections in their proper sequence. I did this, including the tolls provision. The subcommittee of four heard and approved them. The subcommittee of 11 heard and approved them, and then the entire resolutions committee was called together, the platform was read, approved, and later adopted by the convention. Thus each plank passed through several stages of preparation and could not have failed to be known to all attending the meeting of the committee or the various subcommittees.

Now, I want to read a statement that was made and submitted by the distinguished leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. UNDERWOOD. I quote:

I believe that the Democratic Party was both wise and patriotic when it announced a policy in favor of discriminating in favor of our coastwise ships in the Panama Canal.

There is no reason at this time why we should abandon a solemn promise made to the American people in one of the most prominent planks in our party platform.

But we are told that we are violating a solemn treaty made with another nation, and in good faith should abandon the canal to foreign rivals without contest or dispute in order that we may keep our standing in the family of nations.

Not for one moment do I believe that we have violated a treaty right and not for one moment do I believe that the English Government seriously contends that we have violated a treaty right.

Our whole difficulty in the matter arises from the un-American spirit of surrender.

A letter was written a short time since by a distinguished citizen of the Nation, the editor of a great Democratic journal. It is addressed to an unknown Senator, or, at least, the name of the Senator to whom the letter was sent has not been made public. Let me read it:

MY DEAR SENATOR —:

You advocate cloture. All of the opponents of such a method call it gag rule. You believe, as you say, in the will of the majority, and maintain that it is only through cloture that the will of the majority can find expression.

Undoubtedly you are right in the abstract. We are all for majority rule in the abstract. But let us take a concrete case now before the Senate, and see if gag rule means majority rule.

Suppose, by a chain of circumstances, a party is in power which is in reality a minority party, which was elected by less than a majority of the votes cast, which was elected because the opposition was divided, which represents the sentiment of a minority of the voters and does not even accurately or, sometimes, even honestly, represent that sentiment.

Suppose that all three parties in the late election, representing the vast majority of the citizens, and practically the sum total of the citizens, had pledged themselves to a certain measure. Suppose that the party elected had pledged itself to that measure specifically and definitely and positively in its platform. Suppose that the leader of the party in his speeches had committed himself to that particular plank of the platform, and had distinctly stated that the plank was not inserted in the platform merely as molasses to catch flies, but to be honestly and sincerely carried out by the party if elected.

Then suppose that this traitorous party should repudiate its own platform, and this dishonest leader should ignore his own personal pledge. Suppose those elected representatives of the people should defy the will of the people as expressed in the platform of the three parties appealing to the people for their votes, and should act contrary to the will of the people and contrary to the specific pledges of the individuals elected and the definite declaration of their platform.

Ought not some obstacle be put in the way of this betrayal of public trust until the citizens of the country shall have an opportunity to express their opinion of such treachery, and to repudiate such a perjured party at the polls?

Personally I think that every effort should be made to prevent such a conscienceless party from violating its pledges and from betraying the people's trust and the people's interests, and I think that the party will have reason to thank the men who, by means of deliberate debate or any other method, can prevent this party from taking a course so suicidal to itself, so harmful and humiliating to the country.

Assuredly, if it is not prevented from taking such a course, every man in this country who believes in the sanctity of a party pledge or in ordinary honorable dealings between man and man, will do his best to punish such a party and rebuke such a betrayal of popular government, which is government in accordance with the will of the majority of the people.

I, too, believe in majority rule, in genuine majority rule, in a platform which appeals honorably to the support of the people and abides honorably by the expressed will of the people, and I am going to labor for such majority rule and for some party which honestly represents it, not only in its professions, but in its practice.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

Ex-President Roosevelt, referring to this matter, said:

I believe that the position of the United States—as to the Panama Canal—is proper as regards this coastwise traffic. I think that this does not interfere with the rights of any other nation. No ships but our own can engage in coastwise traffic, so that there is no discrimination against other ships when we relieve the coastwise traffic from tolls. I believe that the only damage that would be done is to the Canadian Pacific Railway. * * * We are benefiting the whole world by our action at Panama, where every dollar of expense is paid by ourselves. In all history I do not believe you can find such great and expensive work as the Panama Canal, undertaken not by a private corporation but by a nation, as generously put at the service of all mankind.

In his message of August 18, 1912, written after receipt of the first formal British protest against tolls exemption, after the passage of the bill by the House of Representatives, President Taft said:

After full examination of the treaty and of the treaty which preceded it, I feel confident that the exemption of the coastwise vessels of the United States from tolls and the imposition of tolls on vessels of all nations engaged in the foreign trade is not a violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

I am sure that it is not the intention of Congress to violate the Hay-Pauncefote treaty or to enact anything inconsistent with its provisions, and that it certainly is not its purpose to repeal, by subsequent enactment, the treaty in so far as it represents the law of the land.

The President, then a candidate, had carefully considered this platform and found it to correctly enunciate the policy of the Democratic Party as well as his own views. I would not for one moment do him the injustice of intimating to the contrary. In his letter of acceptance he said:

They say—

Referring to the platform—

It is a very practical document. We are now about to ask the people of the United States to adopt our platform. We are about to ask them to intrust us with office and power and the guidance of their affairs.

I can but wonder why the President changed his views, why he discarded his platform as to this particular matter, why he asked for the repeal of the legislation the essence of which his party had approved. We all were surprised and we all continued to wonder, waiting for the President or for time to advise us of the urgent reasons that actuated him. From the fact that in his message to the Congress he declares that the legislation we are considering clearly violates the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and that he asks for its repeal in support of the foreign policy of the administration, are we not justified in concluding that our differences with Great Britain had some connection with the "other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence"?

In this connection, Mr. President, I also call attention to the action of the President recently, when a committee representing the suffragettes called upon him asking his assistance to their cause. He then said he was unable to grant the request of our petitioning sisters because the Baltimore convention was silent so far as woman suffrage was concerned. At that time he, as the head of his party, was bound also by the fact that the platform did not advocate suffrage—so he said—but on the question of tolls, though the platform favored their exemption, he refuses to follow it. "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

The message which the President submitted to Congress, to which I have just made reference, was eloquent, feelingly made, extremely smooth and graceful, superb in diction, strong in expression; all in all, it was decidedly the most remarkable state paper ever submitted to the judgment of this Nation.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, judging from his recent address on this subject, is not in accord with the Executive. He does not believe that the act of the Congress exempting coastwise vessels from tolls is in violation of the treaty, and he is of opinion that under the treaty the Congress has the right to exempt from tolls all vessels that carry our flag; and he is right. I was surprised at one statement that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations made, and that was this:

We have now taken up this question on our own initiative. No foreign country is making any effort or in any wise attempting to exercise an influence, so far as I know, intended to affect the legislation upon which we are now engaged.

Without detaining the Senate by reading it, let me state the fact that our diplomatic correspondence reveals, what the country well knows, that over a year since Great Britain made her personal protest against the Panama Canal act, insisting, in effect, that it discriminates against Canadian vessels doing business with Pacific ports, because Canadian shippers would send their goods to American ports and to American vessels, and also because it would increase the rates which all other vessels would have to pay in order to make the canal meet expenses.

Mr. President, what does our President mean when he says in his said message, speaking of the treaty—

Its meaning is not debated outside the United States. Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal.

It is not often that President Wilson is mistaken on questions relating to existing facts, but when he says that "everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation," it is quite evident that he has not been correctly advised. In England, in Germany, in France, eminent legal authorities have not hesitated in saying, in substance, that the tolls exemption is in entire harmony with our treaty obligations. The London Law Review, a publication of acknowledged authority in England, commanding the respect of the English bar, discussing this matter, concludes as follows:

To sum up, it is reasonably arguable:

- (a) That the United States can support its action on the precise words of the material articles of the treaty; that its case is strengthened by reference to the preamble and context, and that its case is difficult to challenge on grounds of general justice;
- (b) There is no international obligation to submit the construction of its legislative act by any process of arbitration; and
- (c) That any aggrieved party has an appropriate, and impartial, and a competent tribunal in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Other authorities, learned lawyers, constitutional writers, international authors, in London and in Germany have expressed the same view.

Mr. President, the canal-tolls question, as it presents itself to me, is one of supreme importance to all of our industrial enterprises, for, if we pass this repeal bill, we strike a terrible blow to our home factories, mills, industries, and labor. President Wilson has inaugurated it, but all of the shipping interests of all foreign lands are interested, and are engaged in endeavoring to bring about the repeal of the tolls-exemption act. Why? Because it would give to foreign manufactures and foreign ships

the entire market of all the Pacific coast—ours and southward of ours. Why? Because it would enable them to reach Pacific coast ports and sell their products at prices that would make it impossible for our manufactures, for our industries of every kind and description, including iron, coal, lumber, and all the products of the factories and mills of our eastern States, of Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Texas, and Louisiana—and really the entire Mississippi Valley—to ever reach the markets of the Pacific coast, or to compete for the wonderful trade the construction of the canal will inevitably open up to the west thereof. Why? English, German, French, and other foreign shipowners are enlarging their tonnage, building new vessels, organizing new crews. Why? Because they are calculating to carry heavy cargoes from the Pacific coast and beyond over to Europe, cargoes from Pacific lands as well as our Pacific ports, consisting of wheat, flour, lumber, and fruit. When going for these cargoes it will pay them handsomely if they will carry the manufactured goods of England and the Continent at a very moderate rate on the outward-bound trip, expecting to reap a rich harvest on the homeward journey, and in addition to that, all those vessels will be aided by the fact that their governments pay their tolls, while our ships engaged in over-seas commerce will have to pay tolls for going through our canal. I hope such may not long be the result of our legislation.

Mr. President, for a short time I want to discuss the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and what I shall say referring to it is equally applicable in many respects to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. I am not going to read those treaties now, but I ask that certain portions of them may be incorporated in my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM THE CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY OF APRIL 19, 1850.

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over said ship-canal, agreeing that neither will ever erect nor maintain any fortifications commanding the same or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America.

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain, having not only desired, in entering into this convention, to accomplish a particular object, but also to establish a general principle, they hereby agree to extend their protection, by treaty stipulations, to any other practicable communications, whether by canal or railway, across the isthmus which connects North and South America, and especially to the interoceanic communications, should the same prove to be practicable, whether by canal or railway, which are now proposed to be established by the way of Tehuantepec or Panama.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, by this treaty the United States departed for the first time from the principles enunciated in the Monroe doctrine, and I indulge the hope that no such deviation will ever hereafter be made. Had the treaty not included the language of the second extract from it, to which I have referred, the United States would have been relieved of a great deal of controversy and of a wonderful amount of vexatious correspondence. That doctrine, announced by President Monroe, but in fact formulated by John Quincy Adams, was simply a notice to all European powers that the United States would not permit any of them to interfere on this hemisphere and would not tolerate colonization by any of them on any portion of South American soil.

The fact is that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, from the very time of the exchange of ratifications, has been persistently and continuously violated by Great Britain. Will anyone controvert it? The United States intended by this treaty to obtain from Great Britain a surrender of all her claims to territory in or sovereignty over any part of Central America, and yet almost immediately after the ratification of said treaty we find that Great Britain was extending her colony on the Honduras coast, as well on the Mosquito Islands, and was also claiming jurisdiction over the islands near by. The United States protested, Great Britain continued to disregard the treaty, and finally, in 1856, at the suggestion of the United States, a convention was held in London for the purpose of adjusting, if possible, the then existing differences. The claim of Great Britain was not sustained, and a new treaty substantially in accord with the insistence of the United States was prepared and ratified by the United States, but finally rejected by Great Britain, and the old controversy thus restored continued to disturb our diplomatic relations with that country.

On October 22, 1857, Lord Napier, in writing to Lord Clarendon concerning the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, said, relating to an interview he had had with President Buchanan:

The President commenced his observations by referring to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty as a fruitful source of misunderstanding between the contracting parties. Without that treaty the United States and Great Britain might long since have cooperated for the welfare of Central

America. That treaty had never been acceptable to the people of the United States, and would not have obtained a vote in the Senate, had the least suspicion existed of the sense in which it was to be construed by Great Britain; yet if it were now the intention of Her Majesty's Government to execute it according to the American interpretation, that was as much as he could insist upon.

I added that his excellency was well aware of the convictions conscientiously held in England respecting slavery, and of the respect which Her Majesty's Government owed to public feeling on that subject. I might plainly affirm that a principal motive in framing securities for the after government of the Bay Islands had been the apprehension that, when relinquished by the English authorities, those islands would be settled by planters from the United States, who would bring their negroes with them, and thus establish slavery on soil which had, justly or unjustly been declared to be a colonial dependency of Great Britain.

This is what President Buchanan says about it in his message of December 8, 1857:

Since the origin of the Government we have been employed in negotiating treaties with that power, and afterwards in discussing their true intent and meaning. In this respect the convention of April 19, 1850, commonly called the Clayton and Bulwer treaty, has been the most unfortunate of all, because the two Governments place directly opposite and contradictory constructions upon its first and most important article. Whilst in the United States we believe that this treaty would place both powers upon an exact equality by the stipulation that neither will ever "occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume, or exercise any dominion" over any part of Central America, it is contended by the British Government that the true construction of this language has left them in the rightful possession of all that portion of Central America which was in their occupancy at the date of the treaty; in fact, that the treaty is a virtual recognition on the part of the United States of the right of Great Britain, either as owner or protector, to the whole extensive coast of Central America, sweeping round from the Rio Hondo to the port and harbor of San Juan de Nicaragua, together with the adjacent Bay Islands, except the comparatively small portion of this between the Sarstoon and Cape Honduras. According to their construction, the treaty does no more than simply prohibit them from extending their possessions in Central America beyond the present limits. It is not too much to assert, that if in the United States the treaty had been considered susceptible of such a construction, it never would have been negotiated under the authority of the President, nor would it have received the approbation of the Senate. The universal conviction in the United States was, that when our Government consented to violate its traditional and time-honored policy, and to stipulate with a foreign government never to occupy or acquire territory in the Central American portion of our continent, the consideration for this sacrifice was that Great Britain should, in this respect, at least, be placed in the same position with ourselves.

Whilst we have no right to doubt the sincerity of the British Government in their construction of the treaty, it is at the same time my deliberate conviction that this construction is in opposition both to its letter and its spirit.

Under the late administration negotiations were instituted between the two governments for the purpose, if possible, of removing these difficulties; and a treaty having this laudable object in view was signed at London on the 17th October 1856, and was submitted by the President to the Senate on the following 10th of December.

Mr. Blaine, Secretary of State, writing to Mr. Lowell, minister to England, under date of November 19, 1881, says:

SIR: In pursuance of the premises laid down in my circular note of June 24 of this year touching the determination of this Government with respect to the guaranty of neutrality for the interoceanic canal at Panama, it becomes my duty to call your attention to the convention of April 19, 1850, between Great Britain and the United States, commonly known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

According to the articles of that convention the high contracting parties, in referring to an interoceanic canal through Nicaragua, agreed "that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over said ship-canal, and that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same or in the vicinity thereof." In a concluding paragraph the high contracting parties agreed "to extend their protection by treaty stipulations to any other practical communications, whether by canal or railway, across the Isthmus . . . which are now proposed to be established by way of Tehuantepec or Panama."

This convention was made more than thirty years ago under exceptional and extraordinary conditions which have long since ceased to exist—conditions which at best were temporary in their nature and which can never be reproduced.

The remarkable development of the United States on the Pacific coast since that time has created new duties for this government, and devolved new responsibilities upon it, the full and complete discharge of which requires in the judgment of the President some essential modifications in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. The interests of Her Majesty's Government involved in this question, in so far as they may be properly judged by the observation of a friendly power, are so inconsiderable in comparison with those of the United States that the President hopes a readjustment of the terms of the treaty may be reached in a spirit of amity and concord.

The respect due to Her Majesty's Government demands that the objections to the perpetuity of the convention of 1850, as it now exists, should be stated with directness and with entire frankness. And among the most salient and palpable of these is the fact that the operation of the treaty practically concedes to Great Britain the control of whatever canal may be constructed.

The insular position of the home government, with its extended colonial possessions, requires the British Empire to maintain a vast naval establishment, which in our continental solidity we do not need, and in time of peace shall never create. If the United States binds itself not to fortify on land, it concedes that Great Britain, in the possible case of a struggle for the control of the canal, shall at the outset have an advantage which would prove decisive, and which could not be reversed except by the expenditure of treasure and force. The presumptive intention of the treaty was to place the two powers on a plane of perfect equality, with respect to the canal, but in practice, as I have indicated, this would prove utterly delusive, and would instead surrender it, if not in form, yet in effect, to the control of Great Britain.

The treaty binds the United States not to use its military force in any precautionary measure, while it leaves the naval power of Great Britain perfectly free and unrestrained; ready at any moment of need to seize both ends of the canal, and render its military occupation on land a matter entirely within the discretion of Her Majesty's Government.

The military power of the United States, as shown by the recent Civil War, is without limit, and in any conflict on the American continent altogether irresistible. The Clayton-Bulwer treaty commands this government not to use a single regiment of troops to protect its interests in connection with the interoceanic canal, but to surrender the transit to the guardianship and control of the British navy. If no American soldier is to be quartered on the Isthmus to protect the rights of his country in the interoceanic canal, surely, by the fair logic of neutrality, no war vessel of Great Britain should be permitted to appear in the waters that control either entrance to the canal.

In speaking of this treaty, ex-Secretary of State John W. Foster says (pp. 456-458, *A Century of American Diplomacy*, 1901):

Mr. Clayton, then Secretary of State, entered into negotiations with the British minister, the result of which was the treaty by which the two governments stipulated for a joint guaranty of the canal to be constructed; and agreed not to occupy, fortify, colonize or assume or exercise any dominion over any part of Central America. The treaty was ratified without much discussion, in the belief that it would insure at once the construction of the canal and would exclude British colonization and protectorates from Central America; but it was no sooner published than it began to be a source of dispute as to its scope and meaning. Secretary Blaine, in 1881, described it as "misunderstandingly entered into, imperfectly comprehended, contradictorily interpreted, and mutually vexatious." President Buchanan said, in 1857, that if in the United States the treaty had been considered susceptible of the construction put upon it by Great Britain, it never would have been negotiated, nor would it have received the approbation of the Senate. Mr. Cass, who was a member of the Senate at the time it was ratified, has made a similar declaration.

The American expectation as to the early construction of the canal, with the aid of British capital, was disappointed; and for the next ten years our secretaries of state were occupied in bringing the British Government to an observance of its engagements respecting colonization and protectorates. The treaty marks the most serious mistake in our diplomatic history, and is the single instance, since its announcement in 1823, of a tacit disavowal or disregard of the Monroe doctrine, by the admission of Great Britain to an equal participation in the protection and control of a great American enterprise. The wisdom of that doctrine is most signally illustrated in the effects of this single disavowal, the heated discussion engendered, and the embarrassments which the treaty has brought to this Government, and from which it still suffers.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty was, in my judgment, a fearful mistake, as unfortunate in what it omitted to say as well as in what it did say. As I read it, the United States was bound not to use its military force in matters relating to the canal, while Great Britain was free and unrestrained as to the use of her naval power. Had the canal been built she could at any time have seized both ends of the canal with her battleships, but if an American soldier was needed to protect the interests of his country, he was prohibited from doing so.

Why that treaty was not declared abrogated is to me one of the mysteries of diplomacy. Likely our representatives deemed it best by convention and treaty distinctly to abrogate it rather than to submit to questions that might have been raised in an international controversy. But, nevertheless, the treaty was dead, and there are many who think it should have been so declared by congressional enactment. A careful consideration of the correspondence between Mr. Webster, Mr. Lawrence, Lord Malmesbury, Mr. Marcy, Mr. Buchanan, Lord Clarendon, Lord Napier, the Earl of Clarendon, Gen. Cass, Mr. Fish, Mr. Lowell, Lord Granville, and Mr. Blaine, commencing in 1851 and terminating in 1882, will, I think, compel concurrence with the view I have expressed—that it would have been entirely proper, eminently just and honorable, for the Congress to have so legislated.

Mr. President, there are a number of methods by which treaties may be abrogated or amended, and sometimes they work their own repeal. Charles Henry Butler, in his standard work entitled "Treaty-making Power of the United States," volume 2, page 129, section 384, discussing this matter, says:

In the cases cited which have involved treaty stipulations and Federal statutes, treaties have either been, or have not been, carried into effect by subsequent legislation of Congress; or statutes subsequently passed in conflict with treaties have been held to be constitutional, and to have superseded or modified the treaty, although in many instances clearly in violation of the stipulations therein contained. There are other instances, however, in which the court has held that the treaty is not superseded or modified, but is entirely abrogated and ceases to bind either nation or the citizens and inhabitants thereof. Treaties, which expressly so provide, may expire by limitation of time, determined by the treaty itself; they may also be abrogated, so far as the United States is concerned, by congressional action in several different methods.

First. Either by a formal resolution or act of both Houses of Congress approved by the President, or, in case of his refusal to approve it, passed over his veto by two-thirds of both Houses, in which case it becomes the latest expression of the Legislative department of the Government, and, therefore, the supreme law of the land, and the Executive department is bound to carry out the wishes of the Legislature in express terms.

Second. By legislation, not abrogating the treaty in terms, but terminating the relations existing thereunder, or rendering them impossible of continuance, by enacting legislation hostile thereto, or conflicting

therewith, and which may supersede the treaty as to the special stipulations affected, or in effect abrogate it altogether.

Third. By legislation, which, while it does not directly, in terms, abrogate the treaty, either in whole or in part, or by direct words suspend the operation of any of the provisions, so conflicts therewith that the doctrine of repeal by implication applies thereto as it would to statutory provisions similarly affected; it having been held by the Supreme Court that when a statute can not be rationally construed without repealing conflicting clauses of a previously existing treaty, the treaty must fall and the statute must remain as the latest expression of the legislative will.

Fourth. By a declaration of war in which case treaties with the hostile power are either by force of the declaration suspended during the war or abrogated altogether.

In the same work, volume 1, page 405, section 206, the author, referring to treaties, quotes from "Story's Commentaries on the Constitution," a work that from 1833 has been a standard authority and guide, as follows:

It is, therefore, indispensable that they should have the obligation and force of a law, that they may be executed by the judicial power, and be obeyed like other laws. This will not prevent them from being canceled or abrogated by the Nation upon grave and suitable occasions; for it will not be disputed that they are subject to the legislative power, and may be repealed, like other laws, at its pleasure, or they may be varied by new treaties.

In "Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement," by Samuel B. Crandall, pages 116-7, it is stated:

That a treaty may repeal a prior act of Congress, has been frequently affirmed in individual opinions both of the Justices of the Supreme Court and of the attorneys-general. Mr. Justice Harlan, in the recent case of the United States v. Lee Yen Tai, while holding the treaty of March 17, 1894, with China and the act of May 5, 1892, relative to judicial procedure in the deportation of Chinese laborers, to be not inconsistent, observed, "That it was competent for the two countries by treaty to have superseded a prior act of Congress on the same subject, is not to be doubted; for otherwise the declaration in the Constitution that a treaty, concluded in the mode prescribed by that instrument, shall be the supreme law of the land, would not have due effect. As Congress may by statute abrogate, so far at least as this country is concerned, a treaty previously made by the United States with another nation, so the United States may by treaty supersede a prior act of Congress on the same subject."

Another and perhaps the most notable example of the apparent violation of treaties by the United States through congressional action was the exclusion of the Chinese from our ports, notwithstanding treaty stipulations as to reciprocal rights of subjects of the Chinese Empire and citizens of the United States to freely come and go, each in the territory of the other. The Chinese exclusion acts were claimed by many to be in direct violation of these treaty stipulations, and the various acts were tested in the courts and numerous decisions were rendered as to their validity and constitutionality. The courts uniformly sustained the acts as constitutional. In 1889 Judge Field delivered a leading opinion of the Supreme Court on this subject in one of the Chinese cases, from which the following extract is taken:

The validity of this act, as already mentioned, is assailed as being in effect an expulsion from the country of Chinese laborers in violation of existing treaties between the United States and the government of China, and of rights vested in them under the laws of Congress. The objection that the act is in conflict with the treaties was earnestly pressed in the court below, and the answer to it constitutes the principal part of its opinion. Here the objection made is, that the act of 1888 impairs a right vested under the treaty of 1880, as a law of the United States, and the statutes of 1882 and of 1884 passed in execution of it. It must be conceded that the act of 1888 is in contravention of express stipulations of the treaty of 1880 and of the supplemental treaty of 1880, but it is not on that account invalid or to be restricted in its enforcement. The treaties were of no greater legal obligation than the act of Congress. By the Constitution, laws made in pursuance thereof and treaties made under the authority of the United States are both declared to be the supreme law of the land, and no paramount authority is given to one over the other. A treaty, it is true, is in its nature a contract between nations, and is often merely promissory in its character, requiring legislation to carry its stipulations into effect. Such legislation will be open to future repeal or amendment. If the treaty operates by its own force, and relates to a subject within the power of Congress, it can be deemed in that particular only the equivalent of a legislative act, to be repealed or modified at the pleasure of Congress. In either case the last expression of the sovereign will must control.

The effect of legislation upon conflicting treaty stipulations was elaborately considered in the Head Money Cases, and it was there adjudged "that so far as a treaty made by the United States with any foreign nation can become the subject of judicial cognizance in the courts of this country, it is subject to such acts as Congress may pass for its enforcement, modification, or repeal." This doctrine was affirmed and followed in *Whitney v. Robertson* (124 U. S., 190, 195). It will not be presumed that the legislative department of the government will lightly pass laws which are in conflict with the treaties of the country; but that circumstances may arise which would not only justify the government in disregarding their stipulations, but demand in the interests of the country that it should do so, there can be no question. Unexpected events may call for a change in the policy of the country. Neglect or violation of stipulations on the part of the other contracting party may require corresponding action on our part. When a reciprocal engagement is not carried out by one of the contracting parties, the other may also decline to keep the corresponding engagement. In 1798 the conduct toward this country of the government of France was of such a character that Congress declared that the United States were freed and exonerated from the stipulations of previous treaties with that country.

Relating to this treaty, Butler, in his work on "The Treaty-making Power of the United States," supra, says, on page 138, volume 2:

This question may come before the people of the United States at any time, in regard to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850 with Great Britain. By this treaty this country and Great Britain are apparently pledged to a joint ownership and control of any trans-isthmian canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The treaty contains no provision for its abrogation. It was entered into under peculiar circumstances, at a time when the condition of this country was very different from what it is to-day, and the events which were anticipated in 1850, in view of which the treaty was made, have never transpired. It was undoubtedly a mistake on the part of the Executive to make the treaty and of the Senate to ratify it. The question of its abrogation, however, is one which involves consideration of all of the elements enumerated in the preceding section. To the author it seems as though it is purely a political act wholly within the domain of Congress; that if the Executive can not obtain the abrogation or proper modification of the treaty through friendly diplomacy, that Congress must eventually determine the question; and if, in the best judgment of the Legislative department of the Government, the present and future safety of the country demands the abrogation of that treaty, Congress has not only the legal power but also the moral right to abrogate it, and the judicial department of the Government could not, and would not interfere to prevent it.

Now we come to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

The part of that treaty really in controversy—and the controversy is a most serious one—reads as follows:

The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

This was an agreement between the United States and Great Britain; no other nation or country was a party to it. The United States stipulated with Great Britain that they, subject to the provisions of the present treaty, shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, *as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal.* The United States, therefore, had the sole and absolute control of the canal, and to me it is inconceivable that they should have deliberately taken into partnership with them concerning the canal—especially in the light of the Monroe doctrine and the experiences under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty—the one nation they had been endeavoring to eliminate from all rights and claims in Central America.

I think it entirely safe to say that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty would never have been ratified by this Senate had there existed the least doubt that the United States was to be master of the situation that would exist after the completion of the canal, with the exclusive right to establish the rules by which it was to be governed, subject only to the understanding that all nations observing said rules should be treated with entire equality in such way as would not discriminate against any of such nations in respect to the conditions or charges relating to traffic, which were to be just and equitable. Are not the rules established by the United States relating to tolls just and equitable to all the nations of the world?

Mr. President, there is only one Nation to which they are not just and equitable, and that Nation is the United States of America. At an enormous expense—in all, nearly \$500,000,000—the United States have constructed the canal, and yet the tolls they have provided for its use will for years to come yield a revenue that will be but little more than what will be required to pay current annual expenses, ignoring even interest on the investment and utterly disregarding the matter of profit. Some of the nations of the world expected a toll rate that would not only have provided for the upkeep of the canal, but that also would have yielded an income to the United States at least sufficient to have paid a reasonable interest on the sum expended for its construction. But the United States, in building the canal, intended primarily to provide for their own national convenience and protection, the late Spanish-American War having conclusively demonstrated that it would be the part of wisdom so to do; and secondarily, the desire of the United States was to advance the interest of their own commerce, as also to accommodate and benefit the commerce of the world; hence the low rate of tolls imposed. I doubt if there is another nation that would have so acted. Great Britain, if we judge the present by the past, would not have done so, for she has imposed tolls for the use of the Suez Canal that not only pays all expenses but also handsome dividends. French money built the Suez Canal, but on its completion English money held a controlling interest in its stock and has always dominated it. But the United States, desiring to be fair and equitable, opens the Panama Canal to the vessels of the world, saying to them all, "Partake freely of the advantages we tender you, subject only to our right of absolute control, with the understanding that our flag is forever to float from the point where you enter to the

place where you leave the canal and over its fortifications, a signal of ownership, of power, and of sovereignty."

My insistence is that, so far as her own vessels are concerned, her cruisers, transports, and battleships, as well as the ships of commerce carrying her flag, the United States have the right under the treaty to pass them all through the canal without imposing tolls on any of them. Mr. President, will you tell me, will any Senator here advise me, of the method that will or can be adopted for the United States to pay toll on their own vessels passing through their own canal? Will the officials of the canal impose the usual toll, then draw on the Treasury at Washington for the amount thereof, charging the canal with the same, and then at stated times remit to said Treasury the amount in the hands of said officials due the owner of the canal? By that process how much will it cost the United States to pay their tolls?

I can see how there is ground for difference of opinion as to the expediency of passing some of the vessels of commerce free, but I, for one, conclude that it is not only proper but absolutely necessary that we do so, for the purpose of encouraging our own commerce and building up our merchant marine. Unless we do this it is quite evident that our vessels engaged in the over-seas trade will soon disappear from all ports and all waters.

The statements of some of those who took part in and who had personal knowledge of what took place when the treaty was being formulated have been filed with the Committee on Foreign Relations and submitted for our consideration.

Such evidence has been heretofore offered when contentions similar to the one we are now to dispose of were before conventions and arbitrators. A rule has been established concerning them. They are only pertinent when the language of the treaty in question is confusing, when it forces the mind to doubt, and are never considered if the intent of the contracting parties can be ascertained without resorting to them. In our controversies with Great Britain we have heretofore encountered this same method of disposing of contentions relating to our treaties. In "Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement," by Samuel B. Crandall, we find on pages 225-6 the following:

An interesting use of negotiators' testimony may be found in the proceedings of the mixed commission under Article V of the treaty of November 19, 1794, with Great Britain to determine the St. Croix River and its source under Article II of the treaty of peace. The boundaries of the United States as therein defined began with "that angle which is formed by a line drawn due north from the source of St. Croix River to the Highlands." There proved to be no river in that region then known by that name. Under these circumstances President Adams and John Jay, the surviving American negotiators, made depositions, which were duly admitted in evidence, as to the map used by the negotiators. Likewise a letter written by Franklin was introduced as evidence. Extrinsic evidence of intention can not, however, be accepted in contradiction of a literal and natural interpretation.

Another illustration as to the use of the testimony of those acting as negotiators is found in the action instituted to dispose of certain contentions of Great Britain relating to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. After the ratification of this treaty, and preceding the exchange or communications of the respective governments relating thereto, statements were filed by the negotiators, in which it was said that the language of article 1 of that treaty was not understood to include the British settlement at Honduras and the small islands adjacent thereto. It was in substance held that such statements could not have the effect intended, as they were prepared after the ratification of the treaty by the Senate, and had not been considered by the treaty-making power. It was stated in said proceedings—which repudiated the claim of Great Britain—that if the facts desired to be ascertained could not be found from the language of the treaty that the statements by the negotiators would be considered, but as the words used clearly expressed the original intent the statements must be excluded. (Crandall, supra, p. 226.)

It will be interesting and instructive, I think, to quote from "Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement," supra, page 224, relative to still another controversy we have had with Great Britain as to the construction of a treaty:

Article 1 of the treaty of June 15, 1846, between the United States and Great Britain for the establishment of a boundary between their territories west of the Rocky Mountains, provided for the continuation of the forty-ninth parallel westward to the middle of the channel which separates the continent from Vancouver's Island, and "thence southerly through the middle of the said channel, and of Fuca's Straits to the Pacific Ocean." As a matter of fact there proved to be two principal navigable straits—the Canal de Haro and Rosario Strait—leading from the middle of the channel through the archipelago to the Strait of Juan de Fuca. In favor of the British contention for the Rosario Strait, the one nearer the continent, was the fact that a line through the Canal de Haro must proceed for some distance in a westerly direction, instead of southerly, as provided in the treaty. In favor of the American contention was the

general purpose of the treaty, which, as indicated by the treaty itself, had without doubt been to adopt the forty-ninth parallel as the line for the division of the disputed territory, and to allow a deflection from that line only in order to avoid dividing Vancouver's Island. This view had been expressed in the Senate at the time of the ratification of the treaty. William I. German Emperor, acting as arbitrator under Article XXXIV of the treaty of May 8, 1871, after seeking the advice of eminent German jurists, rendered a decision favorable to the United States.

John Hay and Lord Pauncefoot, who represented their respective Governments in the negotiation of the Hay-Pauncefoot treaty, are dead, and can speak only by the record they have made. The Hon. Joseph H. Choate, who was ambassador to Great Britain, and who aided the two distinguished statesmen referred to in the preparation of said treaty, who is, I am glad to say, still living, has given us his recollection on the subject. Others somewhat familiar with the facts connected with the formulation of said treaty have advised with us concerning the same. It will be observed that respectively they give it as their *opinion* that if Mr. Hay and Lord Pauncefoot were alive they both would say that the exemption of coastwise ships from the payment of tolls would be in conflict with the treaty. The *opinions* of such eminent men, able and honest as all will concede, are entitled to great weight and due consideration, as also are the *words of the treaty* used to express the intent of the parties thereto, which, when taken in connection with the statement of Mr. Choate, which I now quote, "I venture to say that in the whole course of the negotiations of this particular treaty no claim, no suggestion, was made that there should be any exemption of anybody," demonstrates that the usual meaning of said words should be resorted to in order to properly construe the treaty.

Mr. President, let us bear in mind that the canal is not open to all nations, and never was intended to be open to all nations, but open only to those nations "observing these rules." How is that to be ascertained? I presume before the canal is thrown open to the traffic of the world that our Government will have some understanding relating to that subject with the nations desiring to use the canal. The nations of the world engaged in over-seas commerce will express to our Government their intention to observe these rules. Has any of them as yet done so? Not one; and under existing circumstances the only nation in all the world that will not be entitled to the use of the Panama Canal is Great Britain, because in advance she has objected to the rules and indicated that she does not intend to observe them.

Mr. President, as I read the Panama Canal act which we are asked to repeal, it was and is most commendable legislation. Its object, so far as it relates to tolls, is to force real competition in freights, which will aid our producers and shippers and assist in the reduction of the cost of living, at the same time fostering our domestic commerce and forcing the reduction of rates by excluding entirely from the canal all vessels owned and operated by railroads.

Now, Mr. President, it is quite apparent that but for this last provision relating to railroads Great Britain would never have raised this contention. As a matter of fact, she had acquiesced in the releasing of our coastwise vessels, stipulating only for proper regulations regarding them, and she had agreed that they should go through the canal free, but when the Congress in its wisdom saw proper to include with that to which she had so consented a provision that ships owned by Canadian railroads should be prohibited from entering the canal, Great Britain, on the appeal and demand of Canada, presented the contention we are now considering.

The Canadian railroads were affected and the Canadian managers thereof were greatly disturbed, as were those who controlled our own transcontinental railroads. They protested in vain. I commend the Congress for the wisdom it displayed in resisting them. Great Britain felt "constrained" in behalf of her Canadian Provinces to submit this contention, and the Congress felt constrained to decide that it was without merit.

As the law now stands, as it will remain, even should this repeal bill pass, the ships of the United States engaged in the commerce of the world—all of their ships excepting only those engaged in our coastwise trade—will be the only ships that sail "over seas" that will pay toll for passing through the Panama Canal. Why do I say that? Because England, Germany, France, and Italy now pay all tolls charged against the ships of their respective countries for using the Suez Canal and are arranging to do the same concerning like tolls imposed upon them for passing through the Panama Canal. And Japan is preparing to do the same, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] advises me, for which I thank him. Our ships are

struggling now under a burden that I wonder they bear so well as they do. Yet they must pass through the canal owned by their country, and whose flag they carry, branded as the only vessels that, in fact, will pay tolls.

It seems, then, Mr. President, that we have built this canal for the benefit of all the nations of the earth, save only one; for the tonnage of all lands, save only one; for the glory of all flags, except only one, and that one the flag of our country. Mirabile dictu!

I believe the day is coming, Mr. President, fast coming, when all our ships will go through free. If this Congress does not so speak, then, after the people of this Nation have spoken, there will be a Congress that will.

You may call such legislation a subsidy if you please, which, technically, it is not, but it will not scare me, for I believe that by and through such governmental policy all other nations have prospered, and I know, also, that their prosperity has driven our ships from the waters of all oceans. I want to encourage our ships, to add to their number, so that in time they will equal in tonnage and dignity those of any other nation of the world.

I would aid our shipbuilders and our shippers as I have just indicated. I would encourage individuals and companies to employ their capital in building ships and in sending them out on the seas, and I would want them to indulge the hope that they would meet with success and be able to declare reasonable dividends on the money they so invest. Such legislation should not, and would not, be permitted to encourage the formation of trusts, for it will always be under the control of the Congress, and will be simply a just recognition of the difficulties under which our ships and our commerce now contend.

Mr. President, I, for one, believe that it is right that the policy of this Government should be such as to indicate to those of our citizens who have the daring to assume the risks of continuous struggles with nature's elements upon the seas, as also the dangers they will encounter upon the land at home by hostile legislation, that they will at least have the sympathy and encouragement of the Government whose flag their ships will float, as do the vessels of all other nations of civilization. If we but hasten the construction of additional ships, and then by legislation speed their going and their coming, then the Nation that built it will realize some of the advantages that the Panama Canal offers to the world.

Mr. President, am I wrong when I intimate that the time has come for us to speak plainly, to have no further misunderstandings? Is not our experience as to this matter, as shown by our diplomatic troubles relating thereto from 1850 to 1914, sufficient? For me it is. From the early formation of our Government we have been confronted with questions similar to this. By the adoption of our Constitution it became our duty to dispose of others very like them, to which we were obligated by colonial agreements. Is there no way by which we can escape them? Have we not faithfully endeavored to respect our promises? Our fathers knew how to proceed under like circumstances. Washington, Adams, and Jefferson approved of the abrogation of some treaties by congressional legislation. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that method to be proper and constitutional. It may not be best to adopt such methods as a rule, but there are instances, and this is one of them, where the exhibition of patience has ceased to be a virtue and where additional delay will be a national crime.

I have already referred to the decisions of the Supreme Court sustaining the abrogation of treaties by congressional enactments. Has not the time come for another abrogation? I do not believe that it will be dishonorable to so act, as some have intimated it would be. That which is authorized by the Constitution of the United States and suggested by those who made it can but be honorable. If by our legislative acts anyone has cause of action against us, we will not endeavor to evade our responsibility, but will bow obedience to the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States or willingly yield to the judgment of a properly constituted international tribunal.

The time has come for us to declare that this contention with the subtle diplomacy of Great Britain, now over half a century old, should cease. We ought not longer to submit to the uncalled-for interference of a foreign nation in our domestic affairs. Let us throw off the yoke, the burden of which we never should have borne. Let us declare our commercial and industrial independence in a manner that will not admit of doubt, so that all the world will know that it is our intention to hereafter manage our own affairs as to us seems right and just, inviting no outside suggestions and permitting no foreign interference. Let us proclaim that the Monroe doctrine is not dead; that it is no longer sleeping; that it will in the future be en-

forced by the United States as they declared it would be when it was promulgated.

Let us abrogate the Hay-Pauncefote treaty by an act of this Congress. Should this Congress refuse so to do; should it, instead of so acting, repeal the provision of the statute of 1912, exempting coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, thereby continuing our embarrassing and humiliating entanglements with a nation that has been unjust to us from the landing of the Pilgrims and the coming of the Cavaliers; that has been jealous of us from our Declaration of Independence; that has always sought to retard our progress as we have journeyed along the pathway leading from colonial weakness to national greatness, then the voice of the people will be heard when next the ballots fall and a Congress will convene here that will heed the demands made upon it.

Mr. President, if it be true that our Panama Canal tolls act is in conflict with the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, then that act, so far as that question is concerned, abrogates that treaty. You can not escape that conclusion. I submit it to the consideration of those who claim that the legislation of 1912 is in violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. In that connection I have called attention to the decisions of the Supreme Court, in which that great tribunal has held that if a legislative enactment passed subsequent to the ratification of a treaty is in conflict with the treaty, the treaty stands abrogated. Suppose we repeal the act, would that restore the treaty?

Does the repeal of an act, without words in the repealing act, the effect of which is to restore former legislation, have such an implied effect? You can find no authority for any such contention. Mr. President, what a Pandora's box is to be opened up if this Congress indorses the request of the President!

Mr. President, from the time that Columbus landed on a point near where the city of Colon now is, in the year 1502, searching for the great passage about which he had dreamed; from the time the Portuguese navigator Galvão, after exploring the Isthmus, concluded that a canal could be constructed and presented his scheme to the King of Spain, and his majesty, profoundly impressed, as he was, felt himself constrained for political reasons to suppress that scheme, questions relating to a canal through the Isthmus have attracted world-wide attention. It seems strange to say, but it is a historical fact, that for long years in Spain the suppression of schemes looking to the construction of a canal across the Isthmus was resorted to, and the severest penalties imposed upon anyone who would dare suggest it. At that time Spain had dominion over the Isthmus, but Spain feared revolution, as well as interference by other nations. While she so hesitated, while she imposed these penalties, she was quietly working to commence the construction of the canal. In the history of Spain it clearly appears that a fund was being provided which the Government believed would justify it in commencing the construction of a canal in 1521.

Before that time arrived the revolution in the Isthmus resulted in the independence of New Granada, and Spain lost her possessions in Central America. For many years thereafter questions relating to a canal were not discussed. Then came the time when there were grants, subgrants, concessions, subconcessions, and treaties, here, there, and everywhere, relating to the construction of an isthmian canal.

After this, in 1878, Colombia gave permission for the construction of a canal virtually from the bay, where Colon is now located, to the Gulf of Panama. Recall that year, 1878, and remember that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was supposed to be then in force. With that grant De Lesseps, under French auspices, commenced the work of the canal. There was no serious objection to that by either Great Britain or the United States. During that period of French effort we had the first hiatus in our contentions with Great Britain about the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and that period of respite lasted down to the time when the French made a miserable failure of it; when the reorganized company also failed, and the courts appointed a receiver for it. The appointment of the receiver had a revivifying effect upon our British friends, relative to diplomatic correspondence. It has really always been a surprise to me, and I have been unable to account for the fact, that the authorities of this Government having in charge our foreign relations ever consented to the revival of that correspondence, or ever admitted that there was a breath of international life in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

Mr. President, we own the Canal Zone; it is ours for all time for purposes relating to the canal; and no nation will be permitted to question our right or our title to it. We will fortify and defend it against the world, and should there ever arise an issue concerning our right so to do, there are other nations that *quoad* that matter will be our allies. We will have but one flag there, but we will float many of that one kind.

It will float as the ships enter, and will greet them all along the way. Let it fly, Mr. President, from that lofty summit now in the Canal Zone—then part of Darien, afterwards a portion of Panama—where in 1511 Balboa, traversing the interior of that wilderness, believing that he would find the way that led to the northwest outlet, stood upon a lofty peak, which he and his adventurous friends had ascended and in wonder and exaltation looked for the first time upon the waters of the great Pacific. That pinnacle should float our flag, and I trust it will. Our flag should not only greet the incoming vessel, but it should at the exit cheer it on its journey to the marts of the world.

Mr. President, think of the many ships that our flag will welcome, of the many salutes that it will receive! That flag, Mr. President, will speak to the men who man those ships as no other flag can speak. That flag is not dumb; it talks; it typifies much, and many understand what it says and what it means. There will be many men of many minds, of many lands and many climes, of many colors and of many creeds, passing on ships flying many flags, and many of them, seeing our flag for the first time, will greet it with bounding hearts and brimming eyes, for in the distant lands from whence they come they have heard talismanic legends and wonderful stories of it, for the glories of that flag are everywhere known, and its fame has gone forth to the uttermost parts of the earth.

Last summer, Mr. President, I found myself in Naples, that beautiful, busy port on the Mediterranean. To see and to learn and to know, I passed considerable time along its numerous docks and wharves, where many, many ships of all kinds come and go to many, many lands. I found numerous nationalities represented there, strange crafts with strange crews, and I heard a bewildering babel of voices. I gazed upon apparently a countless number of flags, floating from ships loading and unloading wonderful cargoes. I saw thousands of men toiling in that work that goes on day and night, season in and season out. I went here, there, and everywhere looking for a flag that my eyes were longing for, but were not permitted to gaze upon, for I found it not. In all that multitudinous array of ships and flags I did not see a vessel that carried our flag.

Why was that so? Mr. President, we will talk about the cause of it at another time.

But during one of my visits along the coast line of that wonderful harbor, admiring those magnificent quays where the commerce of the world is landed and exchanged, I realized that something was profoundly moving that great heterogeneous multitude, toiling that those composing it might live. I did not understand it. I could see nothing that explained it. I could hear nothing that would account for it. At last I understood it. Work ceased, whistles blew, bells were ringing, men were seeking positions controlling a view of the outer harbor of the Mediterranean Sea. A great steamer is approaching. I looked and the picture was lovely. It filled my soul with joy, for it was altogether beautiful and fair to gaze upon. High aloft, floating proudly, representing power and dignity, was the emblem of our Union, the starry banner of our country, the flag among flags, the one indescribable and indestructible!

I had heard that flag cheered before, but never, Mr. President, with wilder enthusiasm than that motley crowd gave it in that far-away port. They waved at it, they shrieked at it, they threw kisses at it; they were deeply moved, and so was I.

Mr. President, under such circumstances one's heart beats very loud, and his pulses are apt to run wild. Such tribute to his flag, such honor to his country, such recognition of its greatness and its justness indicated that in all lands there is appreciation of the fact that among all nationalities ours is the hope of civilization, and that there is one flag—your flag, Mr. President, our flag, my flag—that stands for all that is worth living for, that speaks for all that is grand of human thought and all that is great of human action. Glorious, exalted beyond description, is that flag—the only flag, Mr. President, that should control the destiny of the grandest gift that, since God said "Let there be light," and there was light, a nation has ever given to the nations of the world—the Panama Canal.

CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, it has seemed to me that while we are all so much interested in matters relating to canals it might be well for us to familiarize ourselves somewhat with those canals in which we have a large interest which are nearer home. I have had the honor to introduce and have referred to the Committee on Commerce a proposed amendment to the river and harbor bill, which provides for the purchase by the Government of the United States of the present small canal between the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays and its enlargement to provide for the great commerce now existing there. It has been somewhat of a pleasure to me to go into the history

of this canal, and I feel it my duty to the people who reside in this great section of the country on the eastern seaboard that I should lay before the Senate the facts which justify the Government of the United States in acquiring this canal, if necessary, by process of condemnation.

Mr. President, the great desirability of connecting the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays was recognized in Colonial times. The second survey for a canal in the American Colonies was made of a route between the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware River in 1764 and a new survey for this proposed canal under the auspices of the American Philosophical Society was made in 1769. In 1799 a charter was secured for a company to dig the canal, and some work was done, I think, in 1804, but this was suspended, a resurvey made in 1822, the work of constructing the present canal actively begun in 1824, and on July 4, 1829, water was let into the canal, which, when constructed, was 13½ miles in length, with a width at water line of 66 feet, at its bottom of 36 feet, and a depth of 10 feet. The canal had cost \$2,250,000, and of this amount the United States Government had contributed \$450,000, the State of Pennsylvania \$100,000, the State of Maryland \$50,000, and the State of Delaware \$25,000, making a total of \$625,000. The balance was obtained from citizens of these States.

CANAL GREAT TIMESAYER.

A mere glance at the map of the Delaware, Maryland, and the Virginia Peninsula and the location of the great cities of Philadelphia, of Wilmington, and of Baltimore will show how desirable this canal, less than 14 miles long, was for the purpose of trade and transportation. Railroads were yet to be constructed. The only method of travel between Baltimore and Philadelphia was by stage coach along the turnpikes or by water out and in the Delaware and Virginia Capes. The distance to Philadelphia from Baltimore by water was 420 miles. The route through the canal reduced this to 112 miles, shortening the distance by 308 miles, and the dangers of ocean navigation were avoided.

The saving of time, even now, in the transportation of freight through this canal between Philadelphia or Wilmington and Baltimore is almost as great as it was in 1829, for freight delivered to the small steamers in Philadelphia at 5 o'clock in the afternoon is carried through the canal and landed at Baltimore at 7 o'clock the next morning—only 14 hours—while the average delivery of freight by the railroads between Philadelphia and Baltimore is something like 3 days. It seems strange that, with all our modern appliances and the boasted management of two of the great railroad systems of the East, we have not been able in 80 years to better much the means of freight transportation in one of the most thickly populated portions of the Union and that we have failed to this time to take advantage of the natural opportunities for traffic and the easy distribution of the necessities of life which lie just at our doors.

On the Delaware Bay and tributaries and on Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries we have a combined traffic, as shown by the report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, exceeding 50,000,000 tons annually; and if to this the undocumented and unregistered tonnage is added, which includes the vast amount handled daily by thousands of local trading boats, the tonnage is estimated to exceed 100,000,000 tons; and this tonnage is almost equally divided between the two bays, the tonnage of Delaware Bay and River and tributaries for 1912, as I compile it from the Engineer's report, aggregating 26,267,335 short tons, while the tonnage on the Chesapeake Bay and tributaries, which I am not sure is as accurate as the other figures, and in some respects is possibly duplicated, amounts to 36,333,489 tons.

In 1904 (H. Rept. No. 2725, 58th Cong., 2d sess.) the combined tonnage of the two bays and tributaries was stated to be almost exactly 50,000,000 tons, and from a statement of the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Navigation, the registered tonnage, represented by 4,391 sailing vessels, steam vessels, and barges, was six hundred and ninety-two thousand and some hundred tons.

The population of the States to be immediately benefited by the canal is about one-sixth of the total population of the United States and estimated at 14,092,627 people.

A LONG-CONSIDERED PROJECT.

The project of an adequate canal connecting the waters of Delaware and Chesapeake Bays has been considered so long that there is a vast mass of official information readily available from which to obtain all information desired on the subject. In 1812, when the Madison administration projected a comprehensive system of internal and coastwise canals, both for commercial and defensive purposes, such canal was approved.

A committee appointed at the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress reported that the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal,

as built in 1829, was encouraged and completed largely because of the realization at that time of the great advantage it would have been during the War of 1812, when the English fleets ravaged the shores of Delaware and Chesapeake Bays and destroyed this Capitol itself.

UNTOLD VALUE IN TIME OF WAR.

Its adaptation for national defense has never been questioned, and this line is now practically assured against attack by foreign fleets because on the Delaware end two new forts have been constructed with modern guns commanding the entrance to the Delaware River below the eastern terminus of the canal, while its western end is protected by the defenses of the Chesapeake Bay.

In 1886 Col. Craighill, of the United States Engineer Corps, reported:

No argument is necessary to show the great value in time of war with a maritime power of such an interior line of communication between the great Chesapeake and Delaware Bays and their tributary streams as this canal would be.

The Committee on Railways and Canals of the House in that year said:

Its entire feasibility has been definitely determined by three Government surveys ordered by Congress.

And President Arthur, in forwarding the report of the Secretary of the Navy, invited the attention of Congress to his recommendations, in which the Secretary said:

To secure the combined commercial and military advantages which these avenues for merchant and naval vessels would afford, the work should be immediately begun and deliberately and economically prosecuted, and not left to be done hastily and expensively in an emergency.

The committee of the House in 1886 recommended the appropriation of \$1,000,000 to begin the work on this canal, and in its report quoted from the report of Capt. Turtle, made to the Forty-second Congress, second session, as follows:

It will be doubted by no one that a deep-water connection between the two bays would be of vast importance in the contingency of war with a maritime nation. Such a connection would provide a means of concentrating the floating defenses of the two bays, and, besides, would render more secure the communication between the naval stations at Philadelphia, Norfolk, and Washington. Vessels defending ports have two offices to perform, the one being to assist in the direct defense, or to prevent capture or occupation by a hostile force, the other being the prevention or breaking up of the blockades.

Without a canal a blockade at the Capes of the Delaware would close the port of Philadelphia, or the blockade at the Capes of Virginia would close the outward commerce of Baltimore and the other ports of the Chesapeake. With the canal built where communication would be secure, neither the ports of Philadelphia nor of Baltimore would be closed, unless an effectual blockade were established both at the Delaware and Virginia Capes. It may be assumed that if a war with one of the great naval powers should arise, and the mere appropriation of the money could provide such a channel of communication between the bays, the amount would be at once provided without hesitation. That would, however, be too late.

Col. Craighill, in forwarding the report from which the above is quoted, said:

The main objects of such a canal are supposed to be two—the greater facilitation of the defense of a part of the territory of the United States by the opening of an interior short line of communication between the great bays, Chesapeake and Delaware, and the shortening of a great route of foreign and coastwise commerce. Both of these objects seem to be of national importance.

In 1894 the President, under authority given by Congress, appointed a board, among the members of which were Brig. Gen. Casey, Col. Craighill, and Admiral Dewey, then a captain in the Navy, and this board, having exhaustively considered the subject, reported:

The most feasible route . . . is substantially located upon the line of the existing Chesapeake & Delaware Canal. In the judgment of the board, this route will be best adapted for national defense and will give the best facility to commerce.

The Committee on Railways and Canals of the House, in submitting its report, April 21, 1904, on House joint resolution 137, reported:

The construction of this ship canal would certainly be the least expensive and most effective method of improving the defense of this locality.

And while treating of the possibility of a coalition of the great naval powers in an attack on the United States with a giant consolidated fleet, reviewed the occurrences of April, 1861, when the present shallow and narrow Chesapeake & Delaware Canal played an important part in the defense of Washington and aided military operations during the whole Civil War.

What occurred in April, 1861, when the railroad bridges north of Baltimore were burned and troops could not be thus sent to Washington, was related before the committee of the Senate recently investigating the value of this canal, and was known to the committee reporting in 1904. Light-draft vessels able to pass through the canal were seized in Philadelphia and along the Delaware River; they were sent through the canal to Perryville, Md.; from there troops were taken by boat to

Annapolis, and thence Washington received reinforcements by rail, which possibly prevented its threatened capture by the Confederate forces. During the whole war the canal was utilized for military purposes and aided greatly in the prosecution of military operations. The committee on the commercial value of the Delaware Ship Canal reported as follows:

The importance and value of the Delaware Ship Canal to facilitate commerce, especially coastwise commerce, will be as great as its military and naval necessity.

WILL ENCOURAGE COASTWISE COMMERCE.

The report showed that 10,000 registered boats were engaged in commerce on the two great estuaries—Delaware and Chesapeake Bays and their tributaries—which had a shore line of 2,500 miles; that the canal would furnish the needed link between the Atlantic coast, north and south, to accommodate both sections, and would be a short and cheap route for the exchange of their products; that it would be of great benefit to the markets of both the North and the South, "stimulating production in the South and cheapening the cost of living in the North"; that it would cheapen the cost of coal to New England, and compared the traffic on the canal favorably with that on the great canals of the world. It showed that the tolls on the canal "are practically prohibitory to most of the commerce that would otherwise use the present canal," and cited the case of the purchase by the Government of the Monongahela Navigation Co., for which it paid the sum of \$3,761,615.46 "to liberate the coal of the West Virginia and Connellsville Basin, and which was fully justified by the stimulus it gave to manufactures along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers." And, continued the report:

The immense commerce involved, as shown by the above table, and which is overburdened or entirely obstructed by the high tolls or the lack of a ship canal of adequate size, would seem to justify Congress in appropriating sufficient money to immediately acquire the franchises and property of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, or rather the interests therein not now owned by the United States Government, which will cost much less than the Monongahela investment, and at once throw it open to all commerce free of tolls, so far as the same is carried in boats small enough to pass through the canal, thereafter treating the canal as a navigable stream, to be improved and enlarged by Congress until it assumes the rank of a ship canal of sufficient depth and width to pass the largest vessels afloat.

The committee recommended that action be taken without delay to secure all data and information available to guide such further action as might appear desirable.

By joint resolution of Congress (public resolution No. 37, 1906) the President was authorized to appoint a commission to examine and appraise the value and works and franchises of the Delaware & Chesapeake Canal, and an appropriation made for that purpose.

This caused the appointment of the so-called Agnus commission, which consisted of Gen. Felix Agnus, of Baltimore, as chairman; Maj. C. A. F. Flagler, now Col. Flagler, of the United States Army, who appeared before the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey at its recent investigation; and Mr. F. T. Chambers, civil engineer, of the United States Navy. The commission reported January 1, 1907. (S. Doc. No. 215, 59th Cong., 2d sess.)

AGNUS COMMISSION FAVORS PROJECT.

This commission obtained and brought together a vast amount of information and reported in favor "of acquiring the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal at an early date, if practicable, and if it can be done at a cost not to exceed \$2,514,289.70," which sum was reached by appraisalment of the works and franchises of the canal, and the commission considered the works and franchises of the canal in three ways:

The canal company valued its property at \$5,348,071. The commission, basing its estimate on cost of reproduction, valued the property at \$3,708,186. The itemized estimate of values found at page 18, Senate Document No. 215, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session, is as follows:

Dry excavation, 15,000,000 cubic yards, at 16 cents.....	\$2,400,000
Dredging, 1,435,760 cubic yards, at 14 cents.....	200,996
Revetment, 80,000 linear feet.....	70,000
Masonry, 44,000 perches, at \$3.....	132,000
Lock at Delaware City.....	120,000
Lock at St. Georges.....	118,220
Lock at Chesapeake City.....	147,970
Land holdings, 8,000 acres, at \$50.....	400,000
Summit level supply.....	5,000
Bridges.....	31,000
Houses, offices, etc.....	30,000
Tools, machinery, etc.....	1,000
Telephone line.....	2,000

Total "cost of reproduction," 1907..... 3,708,186

The commission then valued the stocks, bonds, and securities of the canal company, but was unable to reach any satisfactory conclusion regarding value of the securities, and it seems cer-

tain now that these securities are so widely held and the market value thereof so uncertain that no satisfactory conclusion could then or can now be reached.

Its third method of valuation was the amount of capital required to earn at a reasonable percentage the net income of the company, and it reached the conclusion that on this basis, taking the net income at \$104,118, a fair price for the canal would be \$2,083,600.

It may be well here to state that the net earnings of the canal from figures obtained by the committee recently investigating the subject showed that the net income for the last year exceeded this amount by some \$14,000.

The conclusion as to value reached by the Agnus committee was that the Government should not pay the amount stated as the cost of reproduction, \$3,708,186, but at a fair valuation, deducting the outside holdings of securities by the company, the Government could profitably pay the amount recommended, \$2,514,289.70.

The gross and net earnings of the canal and cost of operation are shown fully in the tables furnished by the Agnus report and in the supplementary report of the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey obtained at its hearings, and for the fiscal year of 1913 exceeded any year since 1888, before which date they averaged much higher than at present, for 1870 having reached \$414,000, for 1880 being \$189,000, as against \$186,000 for the last fiscal year.

The time of the greatest prosperity for the canal, as shown by the short tons of freight passing through the canal, was from 1865 to 1888, when the traffic carried exceeded on an average a million tons per annum, which was carried in boats, barges, or vessels numbering from 16,394, practically the maximum, to 9,000, the minimum.

During the last fiscal year the total tonnage through the canal was 908,594 tons, the number of passages through the canal for the past year being 5,773 (p. 35, hearings, S. Res. 304).

The Agnus commission reported that for military as well as commercial advantage the line of the Delaware & Chesapeake Canal would be most advantageous, and that for military and naval purposes the proposed canal would be of "great strategic value as an adjunct to our land and naval forces." That—

It was the commission's opinion that the deep-water canal across the upper end of the peninsula would be of very great advantage to commerce. It would give the West a seaboard more than a hundred miles nearer the ocean than it now has. It would relieve hundreds of vessels of a dangerous sea route, which in years gone by has cost tens of millions of dollars in wrecks. It would save time and expense to the trade movements of the whole country. It would immediately affect the 11,000,000 people upon the two bays and their tributaries, and would contribute to the interests of all the population. In increasing commerce and reducing the cost of transportation it would stimulate production and be of direct financial benefit to American industries. The commission believes the commercial advantages will fully justify the expenditure of the funds necessary to complete the work.

Concluding its report, the commission said:

The present Chesapeake & Delaware Canal is the most important link in the proposed waterway from the Gulf to the city of Philadelphia for barge traffic, and its purchase and improvement by the Government would be a benefit of extraordinary value.

PURCHASE RECOMMENDED BY UNITED STATES BOARDS OF ENGINEERS.

On December 12, 1911, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors reported to the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army recommending the purchase of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal for the sum of \$2,514,289.70, and its condemnation if necessary. (H. Doc. No. 391, 62d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 273-275.)

It recommended the line of the present canal as the most available and that a tide-level canal, being cheaper to construct, operate, and maintain than a lock canal, would be the most desirable. No damage to banks or interference with navigation being apprehended on account of tidal currents, not even a guard lock is required. The saving in distance for all the water traffic of Baltimore to New York and points in New England would be 184 miles, and the saving by a free canal on existing commerce when the canal should be deepened to 25 feet would be \$1,414,442 annually.

The Chief of Engineers of the Army, January 2, 1912, reported to the Secretary of War that the average saving of lives by the inside passage would be 10 per year, finding this fact from the reports of 32 vessels, in which 49 lives had been lost. During the five years reported on by the Chief of Engineers, 32 coastwise vessels had been lost, and the average annual loss in life was 10; average loss on vessels and cargo, \$100,000.

Without considering savings in insurance, the Chief of Engineers stated that the average saving in coastwise commerce which would use a free canal would be not less than \$1,229,242, and probably would be considerably in excess of that amount.

On February 14, 1912, a special board of engineers, consisting of W. M. Black, colonel, Corps of Engineers, senior member of board; Frederick V. Abbot, colonel, Corps of Engineers; J. O. Sanford, lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers; Mason M. Patrick, lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers; and R. R. Raymond, major, Corps of Engineers, reported to the Chief of Engineers United States Army (H. Doc. No. 196, 63d Cong., 1st sess.), on the cost of construction, maintenance, and so forth, of the Delaware River-Chesapeake Bay Canal as follows:

	Sea level.		2 locks.	3 locks.
	Width, 125 feet; depth, 25 feet.	Width, 90 feet; depth, 12 feet.	Width, 90 feet; depth, 12 feet.	Width, 90 feet; depth, 12 feet.
Cost of construction plus 10 per cent.....	\$12,424,500	\$7,902,007	\$7,803,914	\$7,767,380
Annual interest at 3 per cent on first cost of construction.....	\$372,735	\$237,060	\$234,117	\$233,021
Cost of annual maintenance.....	\$104,220	\$104,220	\$306,420	\$310,020
Annual expenditure.....	\$476,955	\$341,280	\$540,537	\$543,041
Comparative expenditures capitalized at 3 per cent per annum, taking cost of a sea-level canal 125 feet wide and 25 feet deep as 100 per cent.....	100	72	113	120
Time required for a boat with a draft of 10 feet and a beam of 36 feet to pass through the canal, calculated from formula, hours.....	1.2	2.9	3.9	4.4
Time required for a boat with a draft of 16 feet and a beam of 40 feet to pass through the canal— from formula..... hours.....	1.3	Impassable.	Impassable.	Impassable.
Time required for a boat with a draft of 20 feet and a beam of 45 feet to pass through the canal— from formula..... hours.....	1.7	Impassable.	Impassable.	Impassable.

Two-lock canal: The two-lock canal has locks at Chesapeake City and at St. Georges, the summit level being the same as in the existing canal. From St. Georges to the Delaware River the canal is at sea level.

Three-lock canal: The three-lock canal has locks as above and one near Reedy Point, the lifts being the same as those of the existing locks.

The route followed is that heretofore selected for this section of the Intracoastal waterway.

The first costs of the three types of a 12-foot canal considered are practically equal because of the great cost of locks and the pumping plant required to supply the water for the summit level.

Delaware River-Chesapeake Bay section: As shown by the estimates, the saving of cost by constructing a lock canal 12 feet deep, as compared with a sea-level canal of the same dimensions, is about equal to the difference between cost of operating and maintaining the lock and sea-level types for six months. The sea-level type is therefore much cheaper in the end.

Since a sea-level canal is preferable to a lock canal from every point of view, for the Delaware River-Chesapeake Bay section, there would be little gained by deepening the present lock canal to 12 feet as an intermediate step toward a 25-foot sea-level canal. Special barges for a 12-foot depth would not be built for temporary use. The existing locks will accommodate traffic during enlargement of the canal and the change to sea level.

Therefore the sea-level canal 12 feet deep should be the first step. Its construction involves:

(1) Deepening and widening the present summit level and bringing its bottom to the same level as that of the lower reach, including flattening the slopes in the Deep Cut.

(2) Removal of the lock at St. Georges (10-foot lift), making a single level throughout 10 feet deep, with locks of 7 feet lift at each end.

(3) Deepening the whole canal to bring its bottom to reference —12.

(4) Removal of the locks at both ends of the canal, making a 12-foot sea-level canal.

The depth and width can thereafter be increased to the maximum desired.

The board believes that as outlined above the work can be carried on progressively and recommends that early provision be made for its inception and completion to a depth of 25 feet.

On July 22, 1912, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors reported (H. Doc. 196, 63d Cong., 1st sess.) on the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal as follows:

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in its report on the proposed work commented in part upon these two sections as follows (H. Doc. 391, 62d Cong., 2d sess.):

"The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurs with the special board as to the desirability of a free waterway connecting Delaware River and Chesapeake Bay. Aside from its future value as a link in a through waterway connecting northern and southern ports, it will be of great value to existing commerce and will yield immediate benefits. The board therefore recommends the purchase of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, at a price not exceeding \$2,514,289.70, or its acquirement by condemnation proceedings, if necessary. It believes that the question of the enlargement of this canal should receive further study with a view to determining whether a less depth than that proposed by the special board would not adequately meet the requirements of commerce and navigation, and recommends the preparation of an estimate of the cost of a 12-foot canal, which is the depth recommended by the special board, as well as by this board, for the Norfolk-Beaufort section. This can be done under the present authorization [p. 275]."

Delaware River-Chesapeake Bay Canal—Estimates of cost of construction and maintenance of 25-foot and 12-foot canal.

	Sea level.		2 locks.	3 locks.
	Width, 125 feet; depth, 25 feet.	Width, 90 feet; depth, 12 feet.	Width, 90 feet; depth, 12 feet.	Width, 90 feet; depth, 12 feet.
Cost of construction and purchase of Chesapeake & Delaware Canal.....	\$12,424,500	\$7,902,007	\$7,803,914	\$7,767,380
Annual maintenance.....	104,220	104,220	306,420	310,020
Annual interest at 3 per cent on cost of construction.....	372,735	237,060	234,117	233,021
Total annual cost.....	476,955	341,280	540,537	543,041

3. After discussing the advantages and disadvantages of a 12-foot waterway * * * the special board * * * recommends, for the Delaware River-Chesapeake Bay section, the construction of a sea-level canal 12 feet deep and its progressive enlargement and completion to a depth of 25 feet.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, July 22, 1912, concurred in the views of the special board that—

The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal should be enlarged to a sea-level canal 12 feet deep and 90 feet wide at bottom, but it does not believe that the further enlargement to a depth of 25 feet should be undertaken until there has been an opportunity to observe the commercial changes resulting from the freeing of this canal and its first enlargement, and a new investigation has been made to determine the advisability of any further modification that may be suggested by the changed conditions. The board therefore does not recommend the 25-foot depth at the present time, but reports that in its opinion it is advisable to purchase the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal and enlarge it to a sea-level canal 12 feet deep and 90 feet wide at bottom at a total estimated cost of \$7,902,007. The initial appropriation should be sufficient to buy the existing canal, whose value is estimated at \$2,514,289.70.

And on August 9, 1913, Gen. W. H. Bixby, the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, reported to the Secretary of War (H. Doc. No. 196, 63d Cong., 1st sess.)—

(b) In favor of the immediate purchase of the existing canal between Chesapeake Bay and Delaware River and its early enlargement to about 12 feet in depth and appropriate width.

The report was submitted to Congress, August 12, 1913, by the Acting Secretary of War, and included the following:

REGARDING THE FURTHER IMPROVEMENT OF THE ALREADY RECOMMENDED WATERWAY BETWEEN CHESAPEAKE BAY AND DELAWARE BAY, THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS CONCURS WITH BOTH THE SPECIAL BOARD AND BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS IN THE OPINION THAT IT IS ADVISABLE FOR THE UNITED STATES TO BUY THE CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL AT A COST TO THE UNITED STATES NOT EXCEEDING \$2,514,290 AND TO THEN ENLARGE IT TO A SEA-LEVEL CANAL OF 12 FEET DEPTH AND 90 FEET BOTTOM WIDTH, WITH THE LEAST INTERFERENCE PRACTICABLE TO EXISTING TRAFFIC, FOLLOWING, IN GENERAL, THE METHODS INDICATED BY THE SPECIAL BOARD, AT A COST WHICH, INCLUDING THE FIRST YEAR'S MAINTENANCE, AMOUNTS IN ROUND NUMBERS TO \$8,000,000, OF WHICH \$3,000,000 SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE BY THE FIRST APPROPRIATION, AND ECONOMICAL WORK WILL THEN REQUIRE SUBSEQUENT APPROPRIATIONS OF FROM \$500,000 TO \$1,000,000 PER YEAR.

The Chief of Engineers concurs with the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the view that further deepening to 25 feet of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal at an extra cost of \$4,500,000 should await further observation as to the commercial changes resulting from the first increase in canal depth and especially the release from canal tolls. Moreover, the Chief of Engineers is of the opinion that the general public benefit will be that due to the increase of commerce by use of barges in tows and of medium-draft boats; and that the added benefits accruing from heavy-draft boats will be mainly local and consequently should await cooperation by the local States or those most directly benefited. As the work to be done is progressive and, as under present Federal laws, the engineer department can always receive and expend local funds for such purposes, it will always be possible to increase the project depth above 12 feet up to 25 feet as fast as local cooperation furnishes the funds.

RIVER AND HARBOR COMMITTEE OF HOUSE REPORTS FAVORABLY.

On February 24, 1914, the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors reported (Rept. 300, pt. 1, 63d Cong., 2d sess.) on the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, as follows:

The purchase and enlargement of this canal, however, are very strongly recommended by the engineers, which, in the opinion of the committee, is one of the most important links in the proposed system, as it connects two great highways of commerce, the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays, and would, if completed as outlined in the project, save in distance between Baltimore and Philadelphia, it is estimated, about 320 miles, and between Baltimore and the mouth of the Delaware Bay 184 miles, which, together with other advantages claimed, caused the committee to look with favor upon the proposition and to authorize the purchase of the canal at a cost not to exceed \$1,300,000, which is believed to be a fair valuation of the property. There is an alternative route considered by the engineers which may be used if the canal can not be purchased within the above figures, or resort may, of course, be had to condemnation proceedings, as Congress may deem best. On account of engineering difficulties which may be encountered in the enlargement of the canal it may be even better to adopt this alternative route, but that is a feature upon which we will naturally look largely to the engineers for advice.

The canal is owned by the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co., and appears to have outstanding 37,618 shares of stock, par value \$50, held by numerous parties, including the United States Government, which originally paid \$450,000 on the project, and the States of Pennsylv-

vanla, Maryland, and Delaware, which contributed, respectively, \$100,000, \$50,000, and \$25,000 to the enterprise.

It should be added that the original estimates for the cost of this canal and its subsequent enlargement to a 12-foot depth, with suitable widths, were \$8,000,000 to complete, but in those estimates the maximum cost of purchasing the canal was fixed at \$2,514,250. As, however, the committee fixed the maximum amount to be paid for the existing canal at \$1,300,000, the estimated cost by the engineers is thereby reduced to \$6,785,710, the difference between \$8,000,000 and the amount of the reduction in the cost of the canal.

REPORT OF COAST AND INSULAR SURVEY COMMITTEE OF SENATE.

The last report on matters concerning the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal is that of the Coast and Insular Survey Committee, made April 25, 1914 (Senate Rept. 452, 63d Cong., 2d sess.).

That committee was charged with investigating some of the corporate affairs and the value of the canal, having in view its possible acquisition by the United States, as recommended by the various boards of engineers from time to time.

The committee reported that the stock of the canal had no value, but its bonds, amounting to \$2,002,950, have a real and substantial value, the interest on such bonds having been regularly paid at 4 per cent, and, continued the committee—

Unless some unusual and unexpected damage shall occur to the works and property of the canal, it may fairly be presumed that its earnings will be sufficient to pay the interest at 4 per cent on the outstanding bonds, although the average annual net income of the canal company from all sources during the past 10 years (after paying interest and its operating expenses) has been only \$2,989.24. This gives to these bonds a real value which is in some degree indicated by the last sale referred to at 68 per cent of the par. Under the law of the State of Pennsylvania the insurance companies of that State are permitted by its insurance department to invest funds in these bonds at 64 per cent, as shown by a letter of the insurance commissioner of that State sent your committee, dated April 8, 1914.

The company has averaged annually for the past four years for tolls earned	\$175,000
Its cost of operation has averaged during said year	65,000
Its average net income from operation has therefore been for four years	110,000
Interest on its bonds at 4 per cent	104,118

Leaving a net average annual income for last four years of... 5,882 which by comparison with the income of the company for a period of 10 years shows a substantial increase in its net receipts from operation.

Many official reports concerning the canal and its value have been made from time to time by engineers of the United States Army and others. In 1906 a special commission was appointed for the purpose of ascertaining the most feasible route for a canal between the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays. Your committee had before them Gen. Felix Agnus, of Baltimore, the chairman of that commission; Col. C. A. F. Flagler, at the time engineer in charge of that district; and Gen. William H. Bixby (retired), late Chief of Engineers of the United States Army. These gentlemen have as close and intimate knowledge with the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal as it is possible for the officials who have been charged with the duty of ascertaining the value of the canal to obtain from close study of the physical condition of the canal itself and investigation of all its affairs and property, as well as the value of the canal to the Government for military and naval purposes and as an aid to commerce.

The Agnus commission, when Col. Flagler (then major of Engineers, United States Army) had charge of the Wilmington (Del.) district, made a detailed valuation of the works and property of the canal, which may be found at page 18, Senate Document 215, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session. The value there given is \$2,708,180.

Gen. Bixby, in his testimony before this committee (p. 126), confirmed this valuation, and showed that no new appraisalment was necessary, as the appraisalment made in 1906 was confirmed by present cost prices of materials. Gen. Bixby's statement regarding the value of the canal was as follows:

"While the cost per unit might differ a little bit to-day, the total cost, if we were making a new appraisalment based on the figures of quantities that the commission verified, would go over \$3,000,000 all the same, which is a price that is greater than the price which has been previously recommended for payment to the canal company. In other words, the price at which the Agnus Board and the other boards have concluded was best to stand by as a payment to the canal company was a price based upon its value as a going concern, which is less than what it might cost to reproduce the properties, and therefore they have all concurred with them that the recommendation which has been made for \$2,500,000 was not too high, and if it erred anywhere it was perhaps too low, because we know that to do the same work to-day in that locality we can not get it for any less money (p. 126)."

And at page 123 Gen. Bixby, referring to the benefits which would be derived to commerce by making the canal a free canal under governmental control, said:

"The board, in figuring out the net benefit of \$1,414,000 a year, figured on shipments from northern points estimated at 1,430,000 tons, shipments from southern points estimated at 1,107,000 tons, making a total of 2,537,000 and odd tons."

The former Chief of Engineers in giving his testimony showed the great benefit which had been derived in various sections with which he was personally familiar, where somewhat similar improvements had been made.

Col. Flagler, in his testimony, stated that the cost of building another canal reasonably near the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal would largely exceed the estimates on which the purchase was recommended by the commission for the amount of \$2,514,000, and stated (p. 117), "The distance from Baltimore to Philadelphia will be shortened by 323 miles; from Baltimore to the mouth of the Delaware Bay, by 184 miles;" should the canal be properly deepened and controlled. To shorten the distance between Baltimore and the mouth of the Delaware Bay was given to show how much less the distance would be from Baltimore to New York and New England points.

Ever since the Agnus report in 1907, wherein the cost of reproduction, estimate of properties and appurtenances of the canal, and other

elements entering into its value were carefully considered, the conclusion reached by that commission that the Government could afford to pay and should acquire the canal for the sum of \$2,514,289.70 has been concurred in by all Government officials, Army engineers, and persons reporting on the canal as a fair price to be paid. This amount was reached by the commission after careful consideration given the matter, being shown on pages 17 to 20, inclusive, of the Agnus report.

After full consideration by your committee of all official reports on this canal, the testimony taken by it and information which it has obtained regarding the possible value of the canal to the owners and holders of its stock, bonds, and obligations, your committee has reached the conclusion that while the stock and obligations of the company by the expenditure of some millions of dollars might be made much more valuable, the present value of the canal, as shown by its earning capacity, does not exceed \$2,100,000, and that its bonds are not worth, considering the value of the property by which they are secured and the present and prospective earnings of the property mortgaged to secure them, more than 80 per cent of their face value, which would be approximately \$2,100,000.

Your committee believe that the acquisition of the canal by the Government without resort by it to condemnation proceedings is practically impossible, because in addition to holding the securities with the hope that the Government will at least pay the par value of the bonds, the owners and holders of the stock and bonds are so widely scattered as to render it impracticable to deal with them individually and thus acquire their holdings.

We therefore conclude that the appropriation carried in the present river and harbor bill will prove insufficient to acquire the canal, that condemnation proceedings must be resorted to ultimately and should be provided for in any appropriation made with the expectation of acquiring the canal, and that the amount necessary to pay an award in condemnation proceedings will not be less than \$2,000,000 and may reach \$2,500,000.

MANIFEST ADVANTAGES TO THE PEOPLE.

Of necessity, Mr. President, I have been compelled in proving by the opinions of the best engineers the advisability of the acquisition by the Government of the Delaware & Chesapeake Canal to quote extensively from the many official reports which have been made from time to time on this subject. The advantages of its acquisition by the Government to the people of a great section of the country appears so manifest that the work of bringing together the extracts from these opinions and reports seems almost unnecessary.

Those who labor upon the great Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries will have opened to them, by quick water transportation, the markets where millions of people in the great cities of Trenton, Camden, Philadelphia, Chester, Wilmington, and the surrounding territory purchase their food. The people of these great communities will have opened to them, by quick water transportation, the great markets where the people of Baltimore, Annapolis, Norfolk, and the South purchase the manufactured articles necessary for their daily use. Millions of tons of freight will be interchanged and enhanced in value by the readiness with which customers can obtain the necessities of life. Millions of people will be benefited by the lessened cost of articles they daily use.

If those who know best about this great work are not absolutely and entirely mistaken, the military and naval defenses of a great portion of our eastern seaboard will be more than doubled and the strength of this Government can be readily concentrated at any point where attack is to be feared. The cost of making such concentration possible will only be that of one or two ships of war, and from 10 to 20 per cent—possibly a greater percentage than that—on its cost will be saved to the commerce of the country annually.

The canal completed in accordance with the estimate of the engineers will prove an automatic regulation of railroad rates, and at the same time relieve the railroads of their congested traffic, to the great benefit of all their customers.

Resolutions of public bodies have been passed year after year urging this improvement upon Congress.

FAVORED IN NATIONAL PLATFORMS.

The acquisition of this canal by the Government will be in accord with the last two platforms of the now dominant party in this country. In its platform at Denver, in 1908, the Democratic Party declared:

Water furnishes the cheaper means of transportation, and the National Government, having control of navigable waters, should improve them to their fullest capacity. * * * We favor, when practicable, the connection * * * of the navigable rivers with each other, by artificial canals, with a view of perfecting a system of inland waterways to be navigated by vessels of standard draft.

At Baltimore, in 1912, its declaration was as follows:

We favor the adoption of a liberal and comprehensive plan for the development and improvement of our inland waterways with economy and efficiency, so as to permit their navigation by vessels of standard draft.

SUMMARY.

There can be no better place found in the Union to test the value of a modern canal than by the purchase and enlargement of the now small waterway between the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays. A great traffic already exists, and the amount of its

interchange between producer and consumer will thoroughly test out the great project of an intracoastal waterway.

The Government, according to the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury of April 4, 1914 (S. Doc. No. 462, 63d Cong., 2d sess.), has already invested in this project \$472,309.62. The Maryland Board of Public Works, as long ago as November, 1906, declared it to be the sense of that board that the State, owning \$81,250 of the stock of the canal company, should contribute its holdings toward the project if the Government would purchase the canal and make it a free and open waterway.

Wide markets where millions of consumers will be benefited will open to the people of Maryland and Virginia engaged in producing the necessities of life. Exchange of manufactured goods for foodstuffs will be increased for the benefit of all.

It is difficult—indeed, impossible—to accurately estimate the great advantage which will flow from unfettering the commerce of the two sections and making easy the free interchange of between fifty and a hundred millions of tons annually, which is the combined commerce of the two bays.

The Government can obtain this waterway at less than its actual cost and with a certainty that no loss will be incurred. The character of the project is not a new one. A similar but smaller project of this character was carried through when the Government purchased the Chesapeake & Albemarle Canal, and the advantages of that purchase have already been proven in some measure.

The Seattle canal now being constructed from the Sound to a lake furnishes another example.

Another instance where the Government entered upon a more comprehensive and profitable project was in the case of the Monongahela Navigation Co., which opened the coal fields to the commerce of the Ohio River, and the wisdom of that project was quickly realized. Still another was in the case of the Soo Canal, where the United States instituted condemnation proceedings to unfetter the commerce of the Lakes, so that there is no new proposal here and no new field of national effort is proposed.

The entire project of linking together the North and the South by a system of intracoastal canals depends for its success upon the acquisition and improvement of this comparatively small canal in the most thickly settled portion of the Union. It has been recommended so often and its benefits so widely advertised by resolutions of boards of trade and waterways conventions that there are no two opinions among those who know the situation.

It is no small thing to take into consideration that approximately 10 human lives will be saved each year, now sacrificed to the fury of the sea on the outside passage between the Delaware and Virginia Capes, if this waterway should be properly opened.

Existing as it now does, it may be said to be almost an obstruction to commerce rather than a benefit, for if it did not exist at all the short barrier to the interchange of the great commerce of the two bays and their tributaries would not be allowed long to exist.

The people of my own State, while they are interested in the project, are not, in my opinion, those who will be the most greatly benefited. The great commercial center of Baltimore and the great body of wage earners at Philadelphia will obtain the chief benefits and advantages which will flow from this great but at the same time comparatively inexpensive public work. But I realize, I think, Mr. President, how great a benefit the people of the great middle section of the Atlantic seaboard will receive, and if, by agitating the project and bringing together in connected form the expert opinions, the technical knowledge, the expression of those of great experience, I may have been able in some slight degree to further this work, the labor which it has entailed will not be without its reward.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to give a notice?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield for that purpose.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Tuesday, May 12, following the address of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], I will briefly address the Senate on certain phases of the bill relative to Panama Canal tolls.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) authorizing the President to detail Lieut. Frederick Mears to service in connection with proposed Alaskan railroad.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13770) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Cal.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 263) designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 12291. An act to increase the limit of cost for the extension, remodeling, and improvement of the Pensacola (Fla.) post office and courthouse, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13770. An act to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest and Yosemite National Park, Cal.; and H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After two hours and fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, May 9, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8, 1914.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Edmund James, of Carson City, Nev., to be receiver of public moneys at Carson City, Nev., vice Earl W. Tremont, deceased.
William H. Edley, of Powell, Wyo., to be receiver of public moneys at Lander, Wyo., vice Marvin B. Rhodes, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 8, 1914.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

William R. Waller to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama.

POSTMASTERS.

KANSAS.

Celia Hughes, Weir.

KENTUCKY.

W. C. Sleet, Middlesboro.

LOUISIANA.

E. O. Lalande, Napoleonville.
Washington J. P. Prescott, Garyville.

MAINE.

Alfred T. Hicks, Auburn.
Morrill McKenney, Richmond.

MISSOURI.

Henry S. Hook, Jamesport.

MONTANA.

Samuel Hilburn, Kallispell.

NEBRASKA.

J. O. Blauser, Diller.
Claude J. Brown, Lynch.
Thomas T. Osterman, Blair.
Edward W. Roche, Kimball.

NEW JERSEY.

George N. Smith, Wildwood.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

J. W. Applegate, Edgemont.
E. W. Babb, Wakonda.
Matthew F. Ryan, Mobridge.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 8, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee, our Father in heaven, for the intellectual, moral, and spiritual gifts with which Thou hast endowed us. Yet we realize how great is the responsibility in their use. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak; hence we seek Thee for light to guide, strength to sustain, and courage to do in all the relationships of life, private and public, the right as it is given us to see the right, that we may increase our talents and prove ourselves worthy of the trust reposed in us. May we realize that there are but two things worthy of a man, namely, service and character. May it be ours to serve, ours to grow after the manner of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order, and the gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. MANAHAN. When I filed House resolution No. 424, asking for an investigation of the grain exchanges of the Northwest, the Minneapolis Journal editorially accused me of being an interested party in a rival exchange, and questioned my motives in filing this resolution. I think my privileges have been impugned, and I desire to address the House briefly.

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MANAHAN. About 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent, in order that there may be no question as to time, for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, when I filed House resolution 424, asking for an investigation of certain grain exchanges in the Northwest, the Minneapolis Journal questioned the sincerity of my motives. In the editorial I refer to the following statements are made:

It is doubtful if Mr. MANAHAN has been in Congress long enough to expect the House to repair his fences and build new ones by ordering a local investigation for which it can see no public reason.

But if Congress really wants to investigate the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and the Duluth Board of Trade on a serious and sound basis, there is no reason, except useless expense of money and time, why it shouldn't. These are State corporations, have been under close State supervision, and have come with clean hands out of a series of legislative investigations provoked in the same spirit by politicians.

Congress might save time and money, however, by first examining the report of the last legislative investigation instigated by Mr. MANAHAN and Mr. Loftus in behalf of the rival business in which they are interested. The motive actuating Mr. MANAHAN might well be investigated along with the organizations. An improper motive is to be feared as much in government as improper conduct in any other relation.

Mr. Speaker, my motive in urging an investigation of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce appears clearly in the resolution itself. That organization is an intolerable monopoly. It has controlled prices and robbed the farmers of the Northwest for many years. My purpose was and still is to destroy that monopoly. But, says the Journal, I do this "in behalf of a rival business" in which I am "interested." That charge is doubly false, and the writer knew it when he penned the lines. He knew that my whole public career had been one of unwavering hostility to monopoly in every form. He knew that the only "rival business" to be benefited by breaking up the grain combine was the farmers' cooperative concerns. He knew that I did not own a dollar's worth of stock in any of those cooperative concerns. He knew, of course, that these farmers looked upon me as their advocate and general counsel. They never gave me a retainer, never paid me nor promised me a fee. My connection as attorney was nominal, and so understood by everybody. My connection with these farmers as a public man, interested in protecting them from exploitation by either the grain combine or the railroads, was and is real and vital. My father was a farmer. My brothers are all farmers.

I am on their side in this fight for an honest and cooperative market. Every householder in the country is interested as well as I am. I hope I can impress it upon the aristocratic intelligence of the cultured proprietor of the Journal that I am very much "interested" in the farmers' cooperative movement for marketing their produce, and that I am very much determined to smash, if I can, the grain combine that stands in their way.

I have asked this Congress to act. I have urged action by the Department of Justice. I expect to do what I can to get the State of Minnesota to exert all the power it has to destroy the vicious grain-gambling monopoly which for years, like a festering sore, has drained the resources and sapped the strength of agriculture in the Northwest.

But, Mr. Speaker, when a publisher uses the cruel weapon of the press to strike a public man, he invites a careful scrutiny of himself. The publisher of the Journal dare not accuse me of an improper or dishonest act, but resorts to the cowardly method of striking from behind and in the dark. He insinuates what he dare not say. Posing as a saint, he tries to suggest that I am a sinner. I am, sir, somewhat of a sinner, but Phariseism is not my sin. Possibly that is the reason why the saintly Journal of Minneapolis does not like me.

My motives are questioned when I assault the Grain Trust and its gambling, and I am tempted to inquire into the motives of my critic in defending the gambling grain graft. Mr. Speaker, who is this H. V. Jones, the publisher of the Journal, who suggests that Congress should investigate my motives? Are his own motives above suspicion?

Has he any personal experience in this gambling and speculating about which he writes so glibly?

Is he in the service of selfish big business?

Does Jim Hill own his pen and his paper?

The Journal Printing Co. was capitalized at \$200,000. There were 4,000 shares of stock at \$50 per share. On August 31, 1908, H. V. Jones and his brother paid \$1,000,000 in cash for these 4,000 shares of stock. Where did they get the money, and did they pledge their pens when they got it?

Just about a year before this purchase, H. V. Jones, Hal P. Watson, and Lou Watson, doing business in New York and Minneapolis as Watson Bros. & Co., were ruined by the slump in the stock of the Hill railroads. The firm had been James J. Hill's brokers, and their statement showed that they could not pay 50 cents on the dollar. What did they pay their creditors, either before or after H. V. Jones and brother paid \$1,000,000 for the Journal? And who gave the bankrupt, while yet in mourning for his busted brokerage business, credit for one big million dollars with which to buy a paper and preach to the people like a Pharisee? Who gave the cash or the credit?

Will Mr. Jones specifically deny that it was Mr. Hill's credit that enabled him and his brother to pay \$1,000,000 for the Journal? He has stated that the deal was financed by a trust company, but he has never given the name of that company. A trust company is a wonderful thing. It is like charity, "it covereth a multitude of sins." But whoever or whatever the trust that financed the Journal, the fact remains that ever since its invisible ownership has been represented by Mr. H. V. Jones, it has posed as a great moral force and has assumed a "holier than thou" attitude on all issues that do not affect the Hill interests or disturb the easy grind of the grain graft.

To meet the vice of the invisible ownership of the press, Congress has enacted a law requiring newspapers to make certain disclosures, and I am advised that under this law Mr. Jones has made affidavits to the effect that the Journal has no bonded indebtedness and that he and his brother own the stock. Under date of October 3, 1913, the Minneapolis Journal published its statement, which was sworn to as an affidavit, in which, in compliance with the request to state the paper's "known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders holding 1 per cent or more of total amounts of bonds, mortgages, or other securities," the answer was made, "There are none."

During the same month and a few days later—October 25, 1913—Mr. Clifford, the advertising manager of the Journal, in a speech before the Advertising Men's League, of New York, is quoted in the Editor, Publisher, and Journalist, as follows:

The story of this publisher, Herschel V. Jones, epitomizes opportunity. A comparatively few years ago he came to Minneapolis from a stony farming country in New York State—Schoharie County. He went to work as a reporter on the paper he now owns. He was later assigned to market reports—not a much sought-for position on an editorial staff. But he saw in the market reporting opportunity. He put enthusiasm into it—honest enthusiasm. He became a market expert, later he became a national figure as a crop expert, so thoroughly did he do his market reporting. He founded a financial and commercial paper. Later he engaged in the grain-brokerage business; met with unfortunate reverses. He saw an opportunity to buy this paper on which he had started as a reporter. He went out and borrowed a million dollars with a stroke of the pen, because his integrity, his honesty, his ability, had been established with men of finance. Men believed in him.

And later in the same speech, Mr. Clifford said, after discussing certain kinds of advertising, which the Journal refused to take:

Because we do not believe it is right to accept it and because we do not believe it is good business to accept it, even though a good, big piece of that borrowed million is staring this publisher in the face.

Now, I ask, who holds the "good big piece of that borrowed million" that is "staring this publisher in the face"? Does James J. Hill, whose railroads' extortion of freight-rate payers, whose railroads' underpayment of laborers and officers and trainmen the Minneapolis Journal has always defended, own any part of that "good big piece of that borrowed million" that is still staring Mr. H. V. Jones in the face? Or does the grain combine of Chicago—Armour and his crowd—control the trust company which Mr. Jones says financed his million-dollar deal? Mr. Clifford, his advertising manager, says that Mr. Jones became a "national figure as a crop expert." Had he, I wonder, furnished these Chicago wheat dealers the crop estimates and advice as a market expert on which they gambled in grain in the Chicago pit? Do these grain gamblers own any part of that "good big piece of that borrowed million staring this publisher in the face"?

Does the Journal refuse "tainted advertising" to make more effective its service to the selfish and invisible owners who still hold "a good big piece of that borrowed million" staring Mr. H. V. Jones out of countenance as a journalist and poisoning the pen with a stroke of which, Mr. Clifford says, he borrowed the million?

Mr. Clifford doubtless speaks the truth when he says that Mr. Herschel V. Jones borrowed a million dollars to buy the Minneapolis Journal, and that the largest part of that million has not yet been paid. Doubtless the capital stock is pledged or put in escrow by some sort of legal device undisclosed to secure the debt. The Minneapolis Journal obviously has evaded the clear purpose of the law requiring the publication of its real ownership.

Is this dummy proprietor of an invisibly owned newspaper in a position to question the motives of any public man?

His own motives are reprehensible. He seeks to discredit me as a Member of this House. But that is only incidental. His real purpose is to divert attention from the grain monopoly with which he was associated in the past and which he knows is still robbing the producers of the Northwest. He serves as a debtor the selfish purposes of the owners in hiding of his sanctimonious sheet.

Mr. Speaker, I deliberately state these facts concerning this publisher, who by miserable insinuation regarding my motives tries to defeat the reforms I am fighting for in Minnesota. The reform of the grain markets, which he and his paper strive to defeat, is of nation-wide importance, and therefore I place these facts in the permanent records of the Nation. [Applause.]

LIEUT. FREDERICK MEARS.

Mr. HAY, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. SHERWOOD rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] is recognized.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, will the Speaker lay before the House the joint resolution of the Senate, No. 145?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that there are several little things here of some importance that we can get out of the way before we reach the pensions. We have plenty of time for pensions.

Mr. HAY. I am not asking for pensions.

The SPEAKER. I understand; but the Chair would rather clear these little matters up now. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) authorizing the President to detail Lieut. Frederick Mears to service in connection with proposed Alaskan railroad.

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to detail and require Lieut. Frederick Mears, United States Army, to perform service in connection with the location and construction of the railroad or railroads in the Territory of Alaska provided for in act of Congress approved March 12, 1914.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I will state that there is a similar joint resolution which has been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. HAY. I will.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the gentleman mind stating to the House the necessity for this joint resolution designating this Army officer for duty in Alaska in connection with the building of the railroad?

Mr. HAY. Under the law an Army officer of any rank now below that of brigadier general can not be placed on detached service. Lieut. Mears has been on detached service as chief engineer of the Panama Railroad, and under the law, unless this resolution is passed, he can not be used for the service of

taking charge of the construction of this railroad. It is very important that he shall be detailed at once if any work is to be commenced on this railroad this season.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He is in the line, is he not?

Mr. HAY. He is in the line of the Army.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Alaska railroad bill—

Mr. HAY. The Alaska railroad bill only provides for an officer of engineers. He is not an officer of engineers.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this officer to be transferred from the work in Panama to the work in Alaska because his work has been finished in Panama?

Mr. HAY. I understand this officer is now chief engineer of the Panama Railroad.

Mr. MANN. He is superintendent, is he not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. He is superintendent.

Mr. HAY. He is to be sent at once to Alaska.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he the officer or superintendent or engineer who was in charge of rebuilding the Panama Railroad?

Mr. HAY. He is.

Mr. MANN. I think not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, he was appointed superintendent of the Panama Canal Railroad.

Mr. MANN. How long since?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some two or three years ago, I think, and had charge of the building of the relocation of the Panama line and the concrete piers at Colon; and I think it was because of his work there that he was recommended to the Secretary of the Interior by Col. Goethals.

Mr. MANN. I understood that to be the case, but I did not understand that he was superintendent.

Mr. HAY. He is to begin the survey of the railroad in Alaska.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Has the line been selected which he is to survey?

Mr. HAY. He has to go there for the purpose of locating that line.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman stated he was to survey the line. I wanted to know if a line had been determined upon preliminary to the survey.

Mr. HAY. I do not think it has.

Mr. MANN. A commission has been appointed consisting of three members, of which this gentleman is one, for the purpose of locating where the line shall be.

Mr. HAY. Where it shall be.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is this Army officer to be given additional compensation?

Mr. HAY. He is not.

Mr. BARTON. I understand that Lieut. Mears is superintendent of the railroad at the present time, but previous to that time that he was a Cavalry officer; and I would like the gentleman to state the reason he is considered superior to a man who had worked for seven years, as did Col. Sibert.

Mr. HAY. Col. Sibert is an officer of engineers and is employed on the construction of the Panama Canal. This officer has been in charge of the Panama Canal Railway.

Mr. BARTON. Has he done any practical engineering on the railroad work?

Mr. HAY. For the last three years.

Mr. BARTON. On the Panama Railroad?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Col. Sibert, the gentleman should state, is known as a builder of dams. This man, Lieut. Mears, every time the Committee on Appropriations has visited the canal, has had charge of the party when they went over the relocated line of the railroad. My impression is he had charge of the building of the relocated line.

Mr. BARTON. The reason I asked the question is that I have heard criticisms along the line that he was a Cavalry officer and had had but little to do with engineering, and that Col. Sibert had devoted his life to it.

Mr. HAY. I take it that he displayed a good deal of aptitude in this work; otherwise he would not have been thought of for taking charge of the work in Alaska.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House resolution 262, of similar tenor, will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5065. An act for the relief of Mirick Burgess;
S. 4373. An act to provide for a commission to codify and suggest amendments to the general mining laws; and
S. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution authorizing the President to detail Lieut. Frederick Mears to service in connection with proposed Alaskan railroad.

S. 1703. An act for the relief of George P. Chandler;
S. 5066. An act to increase the authorization for a public building at Osage City, Kans.; and

S. 4158. An act to reduce the fire limit required by the act approved March 4, 1913, in respect to the proposed Federal building at Salisbury, Md.;

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment, bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 13770. An act to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Cal.

FOREST LANDS IN THE SIERRA NATIONAL FOREST, CAL.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 13770) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Cal., be taken from the Speaker's table, and that the Senate amendment be concurred in by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH] asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 13770 be taken from the Speaker's table and the Senate amendment be concurred in. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

An act (H. R. 13770) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Cal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for five days on account of illness in his family.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House bill 16294, reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16294) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. You would only read the bill for amendment, anyhow, when it is considered in this way.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment. The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 946. James M. Kirk.	H. R. 12264. Rufus Martin.
H. R. 1043. Hans P. Nielson.	H. R. 12268. John Murphy.
H. R. 1161. Mary A. Brown.	H. R. 12317. James K. Butler.
H. R. 1247. John Beazan.	H. R. 12347. Alston W. Whipple.
H. R. 1388. Charles W. Bowman.	H. R. 12524. Mary H. Ford.
H. R. 1393. Isaiah Roberts.	H. R. 12689. Lovina M. Moore.
H. R. 1395. Barney Stone.	H. R. 12706. Allen Farley.
H. R. 1398. William G. Miller.	H. R. 12709. Ichabod S. Prosser.
H. R. 1400. Ezekiel Probus.	H. R. 12733. Gilman D. Willey.
H. R. 1403. Harriet B. Gros.	H. R. 12858. Thomas J. Clack.
H. R. 1549. Sarah M. Mitchell.	H. R. 12908. John G. Purington.
H. R. 2032. Lawson Drals.	H. R. 12977. James E. Smith.
H. R. 2393. John R. Stumpf.	H. R. 13018. George A. Orebaugh.
H. R. 2395. Samuel E. Bish.	H. R. 13049. Edwin S. Palmer.
H. R. 3147. James Crawford.	H. R. 13054. William G. Reppy.
H. R. 3154. Jeremiah R. Thornton.	H. R. 13073. Henry Tomer.
H. R. 3181. William H. Castleberry.	H. R. 13204. Cephas S. Stover.
H. R. 3501. Dora Evaline Brown.	H. R. 13214. Albert H. Shears.
H. R. 3504. George M. Anderson.	H. R. 13242. James A. Hillhouse.
H. R. 4366. Sarah Haught.	H. R. 13246. Thomas Nixon.
H. R. 4561. John Herr.	H. R. 13264. John Breeding.
H. R. 4784. Simon E. De Wolfe.	H. R. 13290. Lewis C. Lawrence.
H. R. 4824. John H. Norman.	H. R. 13291. Louis Champagne, alias Louis Champion.
H. R. 4945. Harvey G. Van Horn.	H. R. 13341. Marion N. Purdy.
H. R. 5032. Julia A. L. Brown.	H. R. 13398. Wilhelmina Wilser.
H. R. 5036. Augustus A. Palmer.	H. R. 13428. Caroline Junker.
H. R. 5280. Catharine Kistler.	H. R. 13469. Matthew S. Kinsken.
H. R. 5324. James M. Vansant.	H. R. 13515. Suard D. Oskins.
H. R. 5342. Henry C. Yates.	H. R. 13516. Richard Riggs.
H. R. 5504. Esther McKean.	H. R. 13527. Similde E. Forbes.
H. R. 5509. Annie Green.	H. R. 13564. John M. Tyree.
H. R. 5513. Andrew Polston.	H. R. 13567. John P. Tomlinson.
H. R. 6043. Lewis Ketchin.	H. R. 13568. Henry Mooncymham.
H. R. 6259. Flora May Baker.	H. R. 13582. Tillie Bucklin.
H. R. 6264. David S. Downey.	H. R. 13588. Samuel W. Roney.
H. R. 6912. David M. Murray.	H. R. 13597. John K. Caldwell.
H. R. 7045. Katharina Brunn.	H. R. 13625. Martha Ayres.
H. R. 7246. Charles Beckmann.	H. R. 13647. Jereasy E. Odell.
H. R. 7306. Lorenzo D. Crawley.	H. R. 13657. Jeremiah M. McPherson.
H. R. 7368. Augusta S. Roske.	
H. R. 7782. Erastus L. Gilbert.	
H. R. 7989. Alfred Richards.	
H. R. 8025. Rufus M. Patterson.	H. R. 13691. Alwilda Wheeler.
H. R. 8104. William T. Beckett.	H. R. 13750. George W. Oakley.
H. R. 8110. Mary Dougherty.	H. R. 13753. William Marshall.
H. R. 8137. Jane H. Johnson.	H. R. 13823. Eva G. Klug.
H. R. 8154. John Finch.	H. R. 13839. John Winemiller.
H. R. 8177. Virinda J. Long.	H. R. 13887. Peter B. Daughters.
H. R. 8270. William Stevenson.	H. R. 13895. George W. Brown.
H. R. 8396. John L. Johnson.	H. R. 13909. James Rauh (insane); Helen Rauh, guardian.
H. R. 8440. David B. Dromgold.	
H. R. 8492. America Pippin.	H. R. 13917. Alfred T. Wilson.
H. R. 8621. Richard T. Turner.	H. R. 13935. Joanna Elder.
H. R. 8626. Daniel Bales.	H. R. 13959. Julius Kramer, alias Joseph Miller.
H. R. 8792. William Jones.	
H. R. 8794. William D. Henderson.	H. R. 13987. Simon Schweigert.
H. R. 8873. Emeline Collins.	H. R. 14028. Amantes Ruth.
H. R. 8944. Granville Deems.	H. R. 14032. William Varian.
H. R. 9082. Hugh B. Neal.	H. R. 14059. Ellie A. Hill.
H. R. 9096. Ellie Jacobs.	H. R. 14060. Arminia Shinn.
H. R. 9151. Robert N. Varley.	H. R. 14074. William H. Williams.
H. R. 9172. Edgar Van Horn.	H. R. 14087. Mollie Thomason.
H. R. 9259. Jacob B. Deardorff.	H. R. 14108. John A. Hall.
H. R. 9337. Millie V. Bennett.	H. R. 14122. Levi S. Tanquary.
H. R. 9354. Orrel Brown.	H. R. 14127. Lydia E. Davis.
H. R. 9381. James N. Dikeman.	H. R. 14132. Oliver C. Howard.
H. R. 9386. Mary Duggan.	H. R. 14137. James Roberts.
H. R. 9396. Mary A. Elson.	H. R. 14138. Cathrine E. Valentine.
H. R. 9548. Mary A. Missner.	H. R. 14147. Sarah E. Irwin.
H. R. 9808. Henry B. Norton.	H. R. 14160. Malinda Logsdon.
H. R. 9863. Lewis Minix.	H. R. 14203. Augusta H. Wilson.
H. R. 9951. Joseph Johnson.	H. R. 14215. Carrie M. Peters.
H. R. 9955. Olive E. Crocker.	H. R. 14218. Alexander Elcock.
H. R. 10044. John Lacey.	H. R. 14245. Peter W. Frederick.
H. R. 10124. James T. McCartney.	H. R. 14280. William A. Boyle.
H. R. 10220. Lucy A. Smith.	H. R. 14281. Owen E. Everhart.
H. R. 10225. Anita Stone.	H. R. 14297. Agnes Mann and Mary Mann.
H. R. 10408. Thomas F. Dotson.	
H. R. 10704. Bernard Daffner.	H. R. 14315. William H. Young.
H. R. 10707. Isaac N. Storm.	H. R. 14343. Isalah Albert.
H. R. 10712. Mary E. Greiner.	H. R. 14355. Frank S. Cashion.
H. R. 10888. Nicholas Brady.	H. R. 14403. Regina Arentsen.
H. R. 10892. Alice Clapper.	H. R. 14418. Hannah Phillips.
H. R. 10976. Susanna Reitz.	H. R. 14429. Darius Spittler (insane).
H. R. 11044. Jennie L. Tallman, now Parker.	
H. R. 11116. Zelotes B. Partridge.	H. R. 14508. Sarah A. Slatten.
H. R. 11150. Francis S. Altman.	H. R. 14526. Ann Buchanan.
H. R. 11164. David Tanyer.	H. R. 14560. Henry C. Wolfe.
H. R. 11186. George T. Kennamer.	H. R. 14574. Jacob Witmer.
H. R. 11259. Joseph S. Wiley.	H. R. 14587. James K. Barkalow.
H. R. 11388. Mary A. June.	H. R. 14590. Frederick M. Halbritter.
H. R. 11369. Lyman Rutherford.	
H. R. 11372. Michael Sheehy.	H. R. 14593. Warren L. Lovell.
H. R. 11428. Mary J. Neary.	H. R. 14597. Benjamin S. Lunt.
H. R. 11447. David Bowen.	H. R. 14602. William H. Phelps.
H. R. 11471. Nabbie E. Ward.	H. R. 14606. Etta F. Pickens.
H. R. 11489. James Hldrith.	H. R. 14634. Frances M. Dumenil.
H. R. 11549. John C. Denbo.	H. R. 14636. Eli Mundorf.
H. R. 11630. Michael H. W. Jameson.	H. R. 14637. Arthur Watson.
H. R. 11668. William McCracken.	H. R. 14638. William H. Wilson.
H. R. 11773. John N. Gill.	H. R. 14648. Mary Jane Kinsey.
H. R. 11788. James T. McIntosh.	H. R. 14654. Jay Smith.
H. R. 11851. Martin Van Hughes.	H. R. 14754. Jacob Miller.
H. R. 11946. Cyrus T. Bowman.	H. R. 14773. Samuel Stalter.
H. R. 11960. Annie M. Maratta.	H. R. 14781. James P. Walters.
H. R. 12021. Mary A. Bishop.	H. R. 14782. Morton B. Pitts.
H. R. 12040. James T. Lott.	

H. R. 14813. Phebe Ann Walls, now Prulltt.
 H. R. 14851. Mary A. Robinson.
 H. R. 14855. Daniel Miller.
 H. R. 14873. Caroline Blom.
 H. R. 14886. Roxiana Wells.
 H. R. 14900. Eva Lochner.
 H. R. 14914. James C. Wiedeman.
 H. R. 15001. Henry C. Palmer.
 H. R. 15029. James H. Tyree.
 H. R. 15031. James Ferguson.
 H. R. 15040. Clara Jane Priest.
 H. R. 15066. Edward Welling.
 H. R. 15084. Robert R. Moore.
 H. R. 15085. Joseph M. Bratton.
 H. R. 15094. Rebecca H. French.
 H. R. 15099. John Fisher.
 H. R. 15136. George Ellars.
 H. R. 15138. Phineas L. Packard.
 H. R. 15170. Mancil V. Root.
 H. R. 15178. Fannie M. O'Linn.
 H. R. 15189. John McDonough.
 H. R. 15212. Edward T. Curtis.
 H. R. 15228. Russell Davis.
 H. R. 15272. William D. Moores.
 H. R. 15294. Francis Gaines.
 H. R. 15302. William A. Akins.
 H. R. 15314. Sarah H. Dean.
 H. R. 15328. Charles Foist.
 H. R. 15338. Isalah Upson.
 H. R. 15340. Delia Keenan.
 H. R. 15345. Hermanis L. Holmes.
 H. R. 15371. Albert G. Daugherty.
 H. R. 15372. Hosea G. Messersmith.
 H. R. 15408. Sarah E. Vaughn.
 H. R. 15421. Joshua Foulk.
 H. R. 15423. Charles T. Owens.
 H. R. 15424. Thomas M. Barton.
 H. R. 15425. Mary A. Gorman.
 H. R. 15427. James Quigley.
 H. R. 15429. Joseph D. Heston.
 H. R. 15445. Jerome Stoll.
 H. R. 15448. Paphiras B. Keys.
 H. R. 15492. Augustus P. Hallenbac.
 H. R. 15518. Ann Eliza Partch.
 H. R. 15521. George W. Carr.
 H. R. 15531. Daniel L. Ordway.
 H. R. 15559. Lorenzo English.
 H. R. 15560. Martina Neuhaus.
 H. R. 15570. Harriet E. Hall.
 H. R. 15583. Martha E. Stone.
 H. R. 15591. Henry Brandenburgh.
 H. R. 15595. James W. Jamison.
 H. R. 15617. Clarinda Shipton.
 H. R. 15619. Emma Gilbert.
 H. R. 15620. Charlotte Mahaney.
 H. R. 15621. Orange S. Church.
 H. R. 15640. Nancy E. Rowland.
 H. R. 15641. Marcus L. Farlow.
 H. R. 15643. John Lesley.
 H. R. 15664. Michael Pierstine.
 H. R. 15674. Frank Bitney.
 H. R. 15717. William Hodgkiss.
 H. R. 15724. Andrew J. Jenney.
 H. R. 15738. Benjamin F. Monticue.
 H. R. 15774. Catherine A. Wood.
 H. R. 15775. Henry Bowman.
 H. R. 15776. Lucien Harbaugh.
 H. R. 15785. Barnett T. Dillahay.
 H. R. 15794. Samuel Wesley.
 H. R. 15796. Rhoda O. Raynor.
 H. R. 15820. James H. Mason.
 H. R. 15821. George T. Murray.
 H. R. 15832. George W. Roush.
 H. R. 15844. William Otha White.
 H. R. 15848. Peter Schnellacker.
 H. R. 15865. William J. Denney.
 H. R. 15880. William Lloyd.
 H. R. 15881. John E. Oylor.
 H. R. 15898. Alletha Stewart.
 H. R. 15901. Sylvanis Davis.
 H. R. 15915. Horatio P. Smith.
 H. R. 15935. Charlott E. Coplan.
 H. R. 15941. Carrie Record.
 H. R. 15947. William H. McCune.
 H. R. 15952. William P. Wilson.
 H. R. 15972. Elizabeth Aschermann.
 H. R. 16104. Christina Demerath.
 H. R. 16063. Anna C. Moore.
 H. R. 16076. John Newhouse.
 H. R. 16085. George Thomas.
 H. R. 6670. Sarah J. Watson.
 H. R. 9233. Benjamin H. Gilbert.
 H. R. 10465. John L. Taylor.
 H. R. 13344. Joseph G. McNutt.
 H. R. 13335. William H. Hastings.
 H. R. 13960. Joseph N. Weaver.
 H. R. 15808. Charles Harris.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up Senate bill 4168.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

S. 4168. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mary Hammack, widow of Andrew J. Hammack, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 2 strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Norman P. Wood, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 7, line 1, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mahala E. Warmoth, widow of George M. Warmoth, late assistant surgeon Forty-first Regiment, and surgeon Fifty-third Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 7, line 20, strike out "\$25" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mary A. V. Sanger, widow of Austin T. Sanger, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 16 strike out lines 12 to 15, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The Senate bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up Senate bill 4352.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

S. 4352. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Jacob A. Shrode, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 5, line 17, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Julia A. Bachus, widow of Lucius A. Bachus, late second lieutenant Company C, Twentieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 9 strike out lines 11 to 15, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William G. Brown, late of Company G, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 16, line 1, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate bill 4552.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

S. 4552. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Abbie A. Upson, widow of Henry Upson, late chaplain, Thirteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 13 to 16, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William Redding, late of U. S. S. *Great Western* and *Collier*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 3, line 13, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John Marsh, late of Company B, Ninth Indiana Legion, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 6, strike out lines 7 to 9, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Daniel Sullivan, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 8, strike out lines 13 to 16, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Peter Prock, late of Company B, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 10, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Austin Groninger, late of Company H, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 14, strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John Johnson, No. 2, late of the U. S. S. *Saranac*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 17, strike out lines 23 to 25, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of George W. Berry, late of Company H, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 19, line 11, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The Senate bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 16345) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mrs. Joseph B. Milbee, widow of Joseph B. Milbee, late of Company A, Second Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12

per month and \$2 additional for each of the five minor children of the said Joseph B. Milbee until they reach the age of 16 years.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 1, strike out the words "Mrs. Joseph B." and insert in lieu thereof the words "Esther A."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 823. Camilla Chambers.	H. R. 11964. James J. Boyd.
H. R. 921. Albert C. Pringnitz.	H. R. 12233. Emma J. Schneider.
H. R. 984. Johanna F. Weand.	H. R. 12607. Jules Toffer.
H. R. 2372. Albert G. Jenkins.	H. R. 12612. Benjamin L. Tubman.
H. R. 2730. Emil G. Herman.	H. R. 12647. Emily Smith.
H. R. 2843. Archie E. Booth.	H. R. 13366. Frank B. Gorman.
H. R. 4347. Curtin Kresge.	H. R. 13751. Samuel T. Grindell.
H. R. 4574. Linda S. Anderson.	H. R. 13760. Charles H. Raymond.
H. R. 5516. James P. Johnson.	H. R. 13778. Gustave W. Koschel.
H. R. 6001. Margaret Duggan.	H. R. 14019. William H. Shipman.
H. R. 6476. William S. Kemp.	H. R. 14088. Eliza F. Greenwood.
H. R. 6875. Daniel B. W. Stocking.	H. R. 14265. George H. Duffany.
H. R. 6946. Thomas Miller.	H. R. 14269. Hulda E. Bickham.
H. R. 6949. James M. Ballard.	H. R. 14270. Mary Ann Foll.
H. R. 6977. Lawrence Dempsey.	H. R. 14718. Mary Fowler.
H. R. 8040. William C. Roderick.	H. R. 14850. Edward East.
H. R. 8136. Carrie Crane.	H. R. 15096. Rudolph B. Scheitlin.
H. R. 8220. David T. Kirby.	H. R. 15642. Young W. Cordell.
H. R. 8263. William C. Hathaway.	H. R. 15720. Eliza Leedy.
H. R. 9066. Noel M. Pursley.	H. R. 15862. Pharaoh A. Cobb.
H. R. 9128. Hester A. Milbee.	H. R. 16030. Julia A. Robinson.
H. R. 10195. Francis M. Cooper.	H. R. 16083. Mollie A. Crosswhite.
H. R. 10561. James A. Stephen.	H. R. 16117. Sophie M. Walker.
H. R. 10962. William Adamson.	H. R. 16245. Eliza Helton.
H. R. 11436. Katherine Hempen.	H. R. 16250. Anthony R. Small.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4657) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Carrie H. Travis, widow of Pierce M. B. Travis, late major, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 1, strike out lines 6 to 9, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Katherine D. Augur, widow of Jacob A. Augur, late colonel Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 2, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Sarah J. Burke, widow of Daniel W. Burke, late major, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, and brigadier general, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 13, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Edward M. Stevens, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 2, strike out lines 20 to 22, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John Cooper, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 3, strike out lines 10 to 13, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Zera F. Etheridge, late hospital apprentice, first class, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 3, line 20, strike out "\$30" and insert "\$12."

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Annie La T. Romeyn, widow of Henry Romeyn, late captain, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and major, United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 4, line 6, strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30."

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Robert B. Courts, late of Company D, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 4, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 79. Carrie H. Travis.	S. 3908. William H. Van Name.
S. 83. Katherine D. Augur.	S. 4029. Teresa Mindermann.
S. 380. Elizabeth K. Norton.	S. 4035. Kate W. Foster.
S. 534. Sarah J. Burke.	S. 4157. Robert B. Courts.
S. 743. Alfred Zemp.	S. 4171. John C. January.
S. 1007. Charles M. Baughman.	S. 4179. Eddy J. Workman.
S. 1107. Edward M. Stevens.	S. 4194. William D. Jones.
S. 1382. Lulu E. Springer.	S. 4223. Margaret R. Flynn.
S. 2460. Barbara Henderson.	S. 4239. Robert H. Cowan.
S. 2491. John Cooper.	S. 4301. Henry C. Miller.
S. 2502. James Henry Martineau.	S. 4313. Fred Mayo.
S. 2519. Zera F. Etheridge.	S. 4355. Minnie C. Fealy.
S. 3138. Harry Willis.	S. 4356. James McMahon.
S. 3407. Dallas Thurman.	S. 4379. Charlotte Perry.
S. 3859. Annie La T. Romeyn.	

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (S. 4260) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Augustus R. Dixon, late of Company C, First Battalion, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 3, strike out lines 4 to 6, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Henry F. Baldwin, late first lieutenant Company A, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 4, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 238. William Guhl.	S. 2537. William N. Russell.
S. 589. Mary E. Macklin.	S. 2566. Mary E. McAuley.
S. 1083. William Llewellyn.	S. 2827. Sarah Ann Jones.
S. 1211. Buford E. De Vall.	S. 3480. Elizabeth A. Tice.
S. 1312. Gilbert Barnett, jr.	S. 3481. Henry F. Baldwin.
S. 1566. Charles E. Stanley.	S. 3670. Gertrude M. Phares.
S. 1586. Arthur G. Bosson.	S. 3857. Michael Reynolds.
S. 2305. Henry Koehler.	S. 3896. Mary E. High.
S. 2432. Augustus R. Dixon.	S. 4010. George W. Goodman.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PRINTING AND BINDING FOR COMMITTEE ON ELECTION OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, ETC.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, which relates to printing for the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 500.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the use of said committee during the Sixty-third Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has not this authorization been granted before?

Mr. RUCKER. No, sir. If it had been I would not ask for it now. I had overlooked it.

Mr. MURDOCK. What printing and binding do you want done?

Mr. RUCKER. I do not know that we want any binding done; but we have had some hearings, and the committee have ordered the hearings printed. They can not have them printed without the passage of a resolution authorizing it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15280) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I wish to see if we can agree on some time for general debate. I would inquire of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] if he has any suggestions to make as to the time he will need on that side of the House for general debate, to see if we can agree before we go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, at the present time I have the small amount of seven hours and a half requested on this side, including one hour for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH], who is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BARTLETT. I recognize the propriety of giving the gentleman an hour.

Mr. DAVIS. Aside from that hour, six hours and a half are apparently the least we can do with.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I have application on this side for about 2 hours and 40 minutes, not including any time for myself. I should say we wanted two hours and a half on this side. Can the gentleman get along with three hours on that side and give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] one hour; that is, say, three hours for your side, three hours for this side, and an hour for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH]?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter, a bill involving an appropriation of \$169,000,000 and the final passage of the bill will not take very long. It would seem as if the gentleman ought to consent to a liberal time for general debate.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Minnesota understands that, as far as I am concerned, I try to be liberal in dealing with Members of the House. I do not desire to be at all illiberal.

Mr. MANN. Let me make this suggestion. I think we ought to pass this bill before we adjourn to-morrow. I doubt if we would do anything else if we passed it early in the afternoon, for to-morrow is Saturday. Why not let general debate run without limit to-day and then agree to-morrow to close debate in time to pass the bill? There are a number of gentlemen who desire to speak, and it is undoubtedly true that you could not bring up anything new with satisfaction to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. BARTLETT. I realize that what the gentleman from Illinois says is true, and I also realize that Members ought to be permitted to have some leisure on Saturday afternoon. The gentleman's suggestion is that we do not limit debate to-day, but agree to limit it to-morrow?

Mr. MANN. Not to limit it now, but do it to-morrow.

Mr. BARTLETT. Can we agree as to the control of the time?

Mr. MANN. I think so. I think the gentleman from Georgia ought to control the time on that side.

Mr. BARTLETT. Can we agree that general debate shall close to-morrow afternoon at 3 o'clock?

Mr. DAVIS. It will not take over half an hour to pass the bill.

Mr. MANN. I think to-morrow you can fix the time for closing debate without any trouble.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. I do not want to make a useless objection, but I want to appeal to the good judgment of gentlemen here. Ten or fifteen hours' debate does not mean one hour of debate on the pension bill.

Mr. DAVIS. A part of it on our side will be on the bill.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are other matters of great national importance pressing for consideration in this House. It does seem strange that we must sit here hour after hour, day after day, listening to political debate at the sacrifice of public business.

Mr. MANN. I think that is hardly a fair statement.

Mr. RUCKER. Well, I mean to be fair; I do not mean to be unfair.

Mr. MANN. There are many Members of the House who have the right to be heard in debate in the House who do not interfere very much in the five-minute debate, and they ought to have an opportunity at some time to be heard on the many questions of public interest.

Mr. RUCKER. I heartily concur in that.

Mr. MANN. They ought to have an opportunity to be heard on personal, political, and other matters of public interest. The gentleman has a bill that I am as anxious should pass as he is, but I do not think it would pass to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman has the same apprehension I have, he must at least fear we will not get it passed at this session at all.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I do not think so.

Mr. RUCKER. We must pass it in time to get it to the Senate and give the Senate an opportunity to consider and pass it.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will pardon me, the gentleman from Missouri may not have been present and heard the Speaker say yesterday that after the disposition of this pension appropriation bill the gentleman from Missouri was to have recognition.

Mr. MANN. Recognition of the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RUCKER. He said he would recognize the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MANN. To report a rule for the consideration of the gentleman's bill.

Mr. RUCKER. Unquestionably; but as far as that bill is concerned, the gentleman from Missouri will not consume more than 15 minutes. If time is consumed, it will be by others.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman might. We can not always tell.

Mr. RUCKER. If you will let the gentleman from Missouri have his way, he will not.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time for general debate be equally divided between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], with the understanding that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] gets at least one hour.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to do that which I never did before in my life and which I am ashamed to do.

Mr. MANN. Then do not do it.

Mr. RUCKER. I will do it. If the time of the House is to be wasted for the purpose, possibly, of defeating other legislation, I am going to have a quorum here to transact business.

Mr. MURDOCK. And hold it here all through general debate?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is quite a job.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to say that I do not always answer the gentleman from Kansas seriously.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I want in a way to support the gentleman from Missouri as to important business pressing for consideration by reading a telegram from the governor of Washington to myself. It is as follows:

OLYMPIA, WASH., April 30, 1914.

Hon. J. W. BRYAN, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Unless bill providing method for direct election of United States Senators is passed by Congress within a short time our State will be

under necessity of calling special session of legislature to make proper provision. Will it be possible to get early action?

ERNEST LISTER, Governor.

Now, that is the situation. A number of States will have to call a special session of the legislature unless this measure of the gentleman from Missouri is passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has stated three different times that as soon as we get through with the pension appropriation bill he will recognize the chairman of the Committee on Rules to call up this bill, or bring in a rule providing for it, and after that is finished he will recognize the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to call up the diplomatic and consular bill.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this suggestion to the gentleman from Georgia and other gentlemen interested: The rule which the Committee on Rules will offer will provide for one hour's general debate. I do not believe anybody will want to extend that time. Would not the gentleman consent, under the circumstances, involving the interests of so many States, to dispose now of the Senate bill providing temporarily for the election of Senators? If that is done, I will not object to 20 hours' general debate.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is not reasonable, and I know he does not want to be unreasonable.

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad the gentleman adds the latter part of his statement.

Mr. MANN. I did not think it was necessary.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire at the present time to say anything with respect to the bill referred to by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman consent to the suggestion which I make?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; I will not consent. This bill has been on the calendar for a month, and it is an important appropriation bill and ought to be passed.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have reference to has been on the calendar for more than a month, is a very important bill, and ought to be passed, and if it had not been for the exercise of the inalienable rights of certain gentlemen by virtue of which time has been absolutely wasted, it would have been a law to-day.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not consider that I have wasted any time.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, I did not mention the gentleman. I am surprised that the gentleman thought I had reference to him.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Georgia any request to make?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I request that the time for general debate be divided equally between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and myself, one hour of the time to be allotted to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH].

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman ask for?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I have not asked for any definite time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate on the pension appropriation bill be controlled one-half by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], with the understanding that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] is to have one hour out of the time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is the intention of the gentleman from Georgia to provide that the hour granted to the gentleman from Illinois should come out of the time that I shall control.

Mr. BARTLETT. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Then the request is that the time be divided equally between the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Minnesota, except that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] is to have one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that means that there is no limit fixed on general debate.

Mr. MANN. We will fix a limit to-morrow.

Mr. RUCKER. And to-morrow being Saturday, and few Members being on the floor, possibly, because nobody wants to hear some of this debate, therefore they will go on and probably fix the time to close debate some time next Saturday following.

Mr. MANN. Next Saturday is to-morrow. We will do that, and pass the bill.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, for the present I object.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I will ask the gentleman not to object. We will pass the bill to-morrow.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman mean that we will pass the bill referred to by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER]?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I have some responsibility here, and I am trying to discharge my duties. I do not intend to allow the performances of gentlemen to prevent an effort on my part to discharge my public duty.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has gone to the limit now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that he has gone to the limit already. He has obtained the help of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I have already objected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be concluded not later than 3 o'clock to-morrow, and that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Minnesota and myself.

Mr. DAVIS. Would not the gentleman make that 4 o'clock?

Mr. BARTLETT. Very well; I will make it 4 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that general debate upon this bill shall close not later than 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon, one-half of the time to be controlled by himself and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], one hour of the time to go to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH]. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is so very persuasive that I will withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the pension appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15280) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, with Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma in the chair.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this is the annual pension appropriation bill and carries \$163,000,000. The last general pension appropriation bill carried \$180,000,000. There was a deficiency of some \$15,000,000, caused by the enactment of the bill known as the Sherwood bill on June 12, 1912. According to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions there will be required for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, \$169,000,000 for the payment of pensions. There will be required \$150,000 for the payment of fees of examining surgeons. The decrease of \$11,000,000 from the amount carried in the bill of last year is due to deaths, which number between 36,000 and 40,000 pensioners a year, or at the rate of 98 and a fraction a day. The decrease in the amount necessary for the fees of examining surgeons is due to the fact that under the service-pension bill and the age fixed for obtaining a pension or an increase in pension examining surgeons are not required to be consulted in order that a place upon the pension roll or an increase of pension may be secured. Ostensibly there will be an unexpended balance of about \$6,000,000. We have not seen fit to reappropriate that, because the Commissioner of Pensions, before the Committee on Appropriations, stated that it might be that it would run the amount required too close, and we did not care to reappropriate the amount and then have to come to Congress at the next session and ask for a deficiency.

In the matter of fees of the examining surgeons, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior desires a change in that method, and I will put that correspondence in the RECORD so as to show the correspondence, my reply, and while there has been no action of the committee upon it, the members of the committee who have been consulted do not feel inclined to permit the amendment to be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] desires to leave the city at an early hour, and in order to accommodate him I yield him eight minutes, and will take up the discussion of the bill later.

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 1, 1914.

HON. CHARLES L. BARTLETT,
Chairman Subcommittee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BARTLETT: I earnestly recommend that a change be made in the method of payment of examining surgeons of the Pension

Bureau for examinations made at the homes of the claimants by substituting a fixed mileage allowance instead of the present method of payment of actual traveling expenses, for reasons which will be fully stated herein.

It is suggested that an amendment be placed in the pension appropriation bill, H. R. 15280, reported by you on April 1, 1914, and now pending in the House of Representatives, by inserting on page 2, after line 11, the following:

"And hereafter the fee for each examination made at the claimant's residence shall be \$5, and in lieu of actual traveling expenses there shall be paid 20 cents per mile for the distance actually traveled each way, but not exceeding the distance by the most direct route between the surgeon's office and the claimant's home."

The present law on this subject is found in the pension appropriation act approved May 28, 1908 (Stat. L. 35, p. 419):

"And the fee for each examination at the claimant's residence, provided his residence is outside of the corporate limits of the place of the regular meeting of the examining board or of the place of residence of the surgeon making the examination, shall be \$5 in addition to the payment of the actual traveling expenses of the surgeon."

The reasons for the amendment desired are these:

As the law now stands, an examination fee of \$3 is paid to a surgeon making an examination within the corporate limits either of the place of the regular meeting of the board or of the place of residence of the surgeon making the examination, and an examination fee of \$5 is paid to the surgeon when the examination is made outside of said corporate limits.

Under this provision of the law it has been found that a surgeon sometimes travels from 16 to 20 miles to make an examination within the corporate limits and receives a fee of \$3, and in other cases he travels less than a mile to make an examination outside of said corporate limits and receives an examination fee of \$5. It would therefore seem equitable to fix a definite fee for every home examination and to allow, in addition thereto, a fixed sum for every mile of actual travel required to make the examination, to compensate the surgeon for his actual traveling expenses.

In a decision dated March 18, 1914, the Comptroller of the Treasury states that under the present law a surgeon can not lawfully be paid for the use of his own conveyance. He says: "Payment to the surgeon for the official use of his conveyance, which is not limited to expenses actually incurred by reason of such official use, is not a lawful charge against the United States."

Train schedules are often such that a surgeon in order to make the trip by railroad must be away from his practice for a full day or longer. If a fixed allowance per mile were made in lieu of "actual traveling expenses," the surgeon could travel by any means most convenient to him. Under the proposed law it would be necessary only to ascertain the total distance traveled in making the trip, and this would simplify matters in every way and enable the surgeon to save valuable time.

Under the present law the surgeons find it very difficult to render their accounts properly, as it requires the securing of subvouchers and making notes of every item of expenditure. Every item must be stated separately and the amount expended shown, for the reason that the bureau must report the amount expended for "transportation of persons," "subsistence and support of persons," "subsistence and care of animals," "miscellaneous items," etc., each amount to be reported separately.

I am aware of the growing inclination in Congress to avoid mileage allowances in lieu of actual expenses, and to substitute as far as practicable a per diem basis of payment, but the latter is wholly impracticable in the case of examining surgeons, because the home examination in nearly every case consumes less than one day, and in many cases only a few hours.

Obviously the proposed law would simplify the matter and much time would be saved in various ways. Unless the law be changed, it will probably be difficult to induce the surgeons to leave their practice to make home examinations, and it will be necessary for the bureau to depend upon surgeons who have had no familiarity with the requirements of the bureau.

Cordially,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1914.

HON. FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary of the Interior.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of your letter of the 1st instant relative to a change in the law governing the traveling expenses of examining surgeons in the Pension Bureau.

The paragraph which you suggest is pure legislation and does not contain any provisions which would make it in order on an appropriation bill by retrenching expenditures. A point of order would eliminate it from consideration, and I feel quite certain that in view of the attitude of the House, such an objection would undoubtedly be made. Under these circumstances, I believe that it is not worth while for me to offer it as an amendment. I will, however, bring it to the attention of the committee, so that they may be familiar with it.

I would suggest that you take the matter up with the Committee on Pensions of the Senate, where the rules governing the consideration of appropriation bills are not so stringent as they are in the House.

Very truly, yours,

C. L. BARTLETT.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, on yesterday the House of Representatives passed unanimously the resolution introduced by me requesting the President to call upon the Government officials and the people of the United States to display the Nation's flag on next Sunday in honor of the mothers of our country. By that act this House has officially recognized and designated the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day. [Applause.] I want to compliment and congratulate the membership of the House for this tender and loving tribute to the mothers of our country.

Within a few minutes Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas, will secure the passage of the resolution by the Senate, and before the day is done, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States will affix his signature to this Mother's Day resolution. [Applause.]

With your indulgence I desire to speak briefly about the mother, the home, and the flag. [Applause.]

The world at times has beat me back in battles I have fought,
Not always has the god, success, touched tasks in which I wrought.
Full oft has fortune dealt a blow instead of bent to bless,
And heartaches followed close upon the heels of happiness.
And often when a solemn woe or grief my heart intoned,
And often when my spirit writhed and all my nature groaned,
There stole refrain that softened pain not born of mortal tongue,
But born of memories old and sweet, the songs my mother sung.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, state government and church government derive their strength and glory from family government, and the good angel of the fireside, the queen of the American home, the American mother, is the most important and best beloved personage in all the world. [Applause.]

John Howard Payne uttered a great truth when he said, "Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home." [Applause.] The man who loves his fireside best is the Nation's best patriot.

The home man's heart turns to, though humble, 'tis fair.
'Tis yearned for the more because woman is there.

[Applause.]

Rome retained her power and prestige until she removed the emphasis from the home and the gods of the fireside fled. The South's eloquent and beloved son, Henry W. Grady, said truly, "The strength of the Republic is lodged in the homes of the people." [Applause.]

Gen. Fitzhugh Lee when asked what is the most beautiful thing in southern social life replied, "Family love in the home." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, his answer, though short, is true. The word "home" with us means more than a place to eat and a place to sleep. It is that sacred place where a woman dwells to comfort and to cheer; where husband and wife dwell together in the bonds of a loyal love, and their children are the priceless jewels of the household, where love for right principles is fostered and genuine affection is the wellspring of life. [Applause.] I care not whether it be in a cabin on the hillside or a marble mansion on the mountain top, if sobriety, love, and contentment are there all is well. [Applause.] It should be the ambition of every father and mother, of every son and daughter, to make home the happiest and most attractive place on earth. It is the duty of every man to be diligent in business, to provide well for those dependent upon him, but this alone will not constitute happiness in the home. A woman's heart hungers for more than food and shelter. It craves kind treatment, and the sweet little courtesies of life. It hungers for soul food—sympathy and love. [Applause.] Man delights to look upon the finished product of his own skill and genius. He is pleased to see all about him the evidences of material prosperity, but there is a hunger in his heart that these will not satisfy. It is that soul yearning for the soft exquisite music of a woman's voice and the tender touch of a woman's hand. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, beyond society's fashionable halls in the sacred precincts of home, there the real potency of her life is felt; there the splendor of her reign is brightest and best; there she plucks the white feather from the wing of truth and wears it in the crown of gentle modest womanhood. [Applause.]

The ideal home is the Christian home. It may not possess the costly furnishings that grace the palaces of the rich. It may not have in it the sculptor's masterpieces of marble. It boasts of things dearer far than these. It has in it the living statuary carved in God's own image—human beings voyaging toward eternity. [Applause.] The head of the family is a sacred person and the wife of that person, the mother of his children, is the noblest work of God. [Applause.]

If the time should ever come when religion is driven from the courts and capitals of the country, from all designated places of public worship, its last retreat will be the fireside, its last altar place a woman's heart, its last lovely scene a mother with an infant at her knee as she teaches him to lisp the eternal name of God. [Applause.]

The most beautiful thing this side of Heaven is the mother's love for her child. It is the only love amongst mortals that will suffer all things and endure all things. Through poverty and good fortune, through sickness and health, through life to death, it is the same beautiful, unselfish, unchangeable mother love. [Applause.]

And he who harking back to youth goes forth and nobly tries
To color life to match the light that shines from mother's eyes,
And he who with an earnest faith his after life attunes
To those old songs of honest love his mother softly croons,
Will not pride his faltering feet upon the race they've made,
But search his heart and bless the part that mother love has played.

[Applause.]

The mother service is the unheard whisper that speaks aloud in human character. The echoes of her gentle tongue have reached the highest peak and her smile has shed a radiance in the lowliest cabins of earth. [Applause.] All honor to the mothers of our country and all hail to our flag on Mother's Day. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago some of the boys in blue died for that flag at Vera Cruz. Every one of them was the son of an American mother. They were her contributions to her country and her country's flag. [Applause.] If her boys can fight and die for Old Glory in a foreign land, we can put it to no higher use nor exalt it more than to unfurl it and reconsecrate it in the homeland on Mother's Day. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this patriotic and loving act will give further emphasis to the fact that the strength of the Republic is lodged in the homes of the people; that the hearthstone is the true altar of liberty [applause]; that "the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world." [Applause.] Then, on next Sunday—Mother's Day—let us unfurl the Stars and Stripes, and from every rooftop fly the flag of the Republic. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I will now further proceed to discuss the bill.

The Secretary of the Interior, in the letter which I shall print, has requested that the committee shall change the manner of payment of fees to examining surgeons, which involves legislation upon this bill, and which, instead of paying them fees limited to \$3 and \$5, proposes to pay them 20 cents a mile for the distance that they should have to travel in going to see the person examined—the applicant for pension. I did not feel that I could offer that amendment for two reasons: First, because it was legislation upon a general appropriation bill, and therefore subject to a point of order; and, second, because I did not feel that I could call upon the House, which has so recently and on various occasions heretofore expressed its disapproval of that manner of payment for services rendered, even by Members of Congress. And I decline to offer the amendment or recommend its adoption by the committee or the House.

Mr. Chairman, this is a large amount of money to be appropriated for any purpose. We are now nearly 50 years away from the end of the Civil War, out of which the greater amount of pensions carried in this bill grew. It will be observed upon examination of the report that the amount we have paid since 1866 for pensions is \$4,586,966,346.09. It is true that embraced in that sum are pensions which we paid up to eight years ago for the Revolutionary War, and up to last year to a pensioner of the War of 1812, and there now remain upon the pension roll 199 pensioners, widows and children of the men of the latter war. It is, Mr. Chairman, to say the least of it, rather peculiar to find myself in a position as reporting from the Appropriations Committee, as I have done heretofore since I have been a member of that committee, the bill which carries this large amount for the payment of pensions, the greater part of which are to be paid to soldiers or dependents for services rendered in the War between the States in 1861 to 1865.

It has always been the policy of the Government, demonstrated by the acts of Congress after the various wars in which we have engaged, to pay liberal pensions to those who have fought the war and to the children and the widows who may have survived them. For myself, Mr. Chairman, I do not carry in my heart any animosity, any dislike, for a real soldier of the Federal Army who fought against the Confederate forces. I am the son of a Confederate officer who gave four years of service to the war between the States upon the Confederate side. I realize it to be a fact that if the Confederate forces had succeeded there would have been no doubt liberal pensions provided for the survivors of that war. The various States composing the Southern Confederacy tax themselves very burdensomely in order to pay pensions to men who served in the Confederate Army and to their survivors. The people of Georgia willingly and cheerfully bear the burden of that taxation. I was myself a member of the legislature which provided for a constitutional amendment granting pensions to the widows of Confederate soldiers. We in the South—at least I believe that to be the sentiment—have no opposition to pensions being paid to real soldiers. It was my pleasure the other day to meet for the first time a Federal soldier who left both his legs upon a battle field in Virginia and who had to get about upon artificial limbs. He was a real soldier. I refer to the present register of wills, Corp. Tanner, whom I had never met before. I would not begrudge a dollar or vote against giving a soldier of that kind and that character a liberal pension. I think he is entitled to it and ought to have it. I would not vote against appropriating money that would pension a soldier who had re-

ceived wounds or incurred diseases or disability in the service of his country. I would not vote in the Legislature of the State of Georgia against giving pensions to Confederate soldiers who were of the one hundred and twenty and odd thousand that Georgia sent to the war. I do not believe, however, that the mere fact of a service of 60 or 90 days ought to entitle a man to a pension unless he is destitute or indigent. I do not know whether this pension roll is a roll of honor or not. I do know, from statements made and charges and evidence, that there are those upon it who were not entitled to be upon it by reason of the services that they rendered. I have nothing to say and no animosity in my heart against and nothing but admiration and love for the real soldier who bore the brunt of the fight for four years and who now receives a pension.

I resided in that locality which was swept by Sherman's march to the sea. My family and my friends suffered desolation and destruction of property and hunger and want by reason of that march. And yet I have no opposition to pensioning the real soldiers of the Federal Army who were wounded or received disabilities and who are indigent; but I do object and protest that those who were camp followers, destroyers, and plunderers, who received large bounties and then jumped them and were again enlisted in the Army, and who followed in the wake of the Army, should not by special provision or other provision be provided with a pension by this Government merely for enlisting and being on the rolls for 90 days.

The animosities of the war, so far as I am concerned and so far as my people are concerned, have died out, and this very week there is assembled in a southern city, near the sea, in Florida, the meeting of the United Confederate Veterans. And one of the things that is to be celebrated is the return of a Federal battle flag taken by a Confederate regiment or company in one of the battles, and the governor of Ohio has sent a special messenger to receive from that old Confederate company the battle flag of an Ohio regiment, to be returned to Ohio.

The real soldiers on both sides of that great struggle honor and respect each other. They march arm in arm and hand in hand when they meet together. It is only those who never smelt gunpowder except to run away from it who undertake to keep alive the animosities of the war.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLINE. I want to inquire if another fact does not evidence the dying out of any animosity, and that is the fact that the governor of Ohio has invited the Confederate veterans to hold their next reunion at the city of Columbus?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; I was going to state that. That is a fact. I know the governor of Ohio personally, and I know that that sentiment comes from his heart, and that it is representative of the governor of Ohio and the old Union veterans of Ohio who really took active part in the Civil War.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know when this great pension roll will be decreased, except by the natural decreases in the death of those now upon the roll. I would be glad if I could see some suggestion that it would be decreased. But if we will have war, if we will have foreign wars and civil wars and civil strife, we must pay for them in pension rolls. The Spanish-American War to-day has been the cause of a pension roll amounting to something like \$29,000,000. So, if we must have armies and navies, if we must fight wars, we must pay the penalty, not only in outright blood and treasure, but history shows that we must mortgage posterity as well to pay the pensions that men receive from having engaged in war or from receiving wounds or contracting diseases.

It has been the policy of the country to do that—to take care of them by pensions. I do not approve of the entire policy. I did not vote for the Sherwood bill. I did not vote for these other bills. My idea is that a pension should be based upon service, upon wounds and disease contracted, and should be given to those who are unable to make a livelihood for themselves. I do not believe that a pension should be paid to those who are not in want or in need. I do not believe that the American soldier would be less patriotic and perform his duty with less valor and heroism if he did not, as has been suggested sometimes, know that he was to receive a pension.

Mr. Chairman, there are some other things that I desire to say with reference to another matter, but I shall reserve my time, and now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND]. I yield him 45 minutes. I will resume my remarks at some time later.

The report on this bill will give full information as to this bill.

[House of Representatives, Report No. 486, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 15280:

The Committee on Appropriations, in presenting the bill making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions for the fiscal year 1915, submit the following in explanation thereof:

The estimates on which the bill is based will be found on page 357 of the Book of Estimates for 1915, and amount to \$169,150,000.

The accompanying bill appropriates \$169,150,000.

The following statement gives, by appropriate title of expenditure, the amounts appropriated for 1914, the estimates for 1915, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1915:

Title of expenditure.	Appropriations for 1914.	Estimates for 1915.	Recommended for 1915.
Payment of pensions.....	\$180,000,000	\$169,000,000	\$169,000,000
Fees of examining surgeons.....	300,000	150,000	150,000
Total.....	180,300,000	169,150,000	169,150,000

The reduction, from \$180,000,000 for 1914 to \$169,000,000 for 1915, in the appropriation for payment of pensions is in accordance with the annual estimates submitted to Congress and is approved by the Commissioner of Pensions in statements made by him to the committee.

The reduction in the amount for payment of fees of examining surgeons in pension cases is also in accordance with the estimates and the recommendation of the Commissioner of Pensions from \$300,000 for 1914 to \$150,000 for 1915; this service is largely diminished, for the reason that many who are put on the pension roll now because of age and service are not required to submit to medical examination.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PENSIONS.

The following table, taken from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, shows the amounts paid by the Government in pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines, their widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, on account of military and naval service since the foundation of the Republic:

War of the Revolution (estimated).....	\$70,000,000.00
War of 1812 (service pension).....	45,923,014.46
Indian wars (service pension).....	12,241,273.61
War with Mexico (service pension).....	47,632,572.34
Civil War.....	4,294,596,944.47
War with Spain and Philippine insurrection.....	42,185,230.84
Regular Establishment.....	28,461,369.52
Unclassified.....	16,499,419.44

Total..... 4,557,539,824.68

The following table, also compiled from the annual reports of the Commissioner of Pensions, shows the number of pensioners on the roll, the annual value of pensions, the disbursements on account of pensions, the number of original applications filed, and the number of original claims allowed each fiscal year from 1879 to 1913, inclusive:

Fiscal year.	Number of pensioners on the roll.	Annual value of pensions.	Disbursements on account of pensions.	Total number of applications filed, original.	Total number of claims allowed, original.
1879.....	242,755	\$25,493,742.15	\$33,664,428.92	57,118	31,346
1880.....	250,802	25,917,906.60	56,689,229.08	141,466	19,545
1881.....	268,830	28,769,957.46	50,583,405.35	31,116	27,394
1882.....	285,697	29,341,101.62	54,313,172.05	40,939	27,664
1883.....	303,658	32,245,192.43	60,427,573.81	48,776	38,162
1884.....	322,756	34,456,900.35	57,912,387.47	41,785	34,192
1885.....	345,125	38,990,985.28	65,171,937.12	40,918	35,767
1886.....	365,783	44,708,027.44	64,091,142.90	49,895	40,857
1887.....	406,007	52,824,641.22	73,752,997.08	72,465	55,194
1888.....	452,557	56,707,220.92	78,950,501.67	75,726	60,252
1889.....	489,725	64,246,552.36	88,842,720.58	81,220	51,921
1890.....	537,944	72,052,143.49	106,094,250.39	105,044	66,637
1891.....	676,100	89,247,200.20	117,312,690.50	696,941	156,486
1892.....	876,068	116,879,867.24	139,394,147.11	246,638	224,047
1893.....	966,012	130,510,179.34	156,906,637.94	119,361	121,630
1894.....	969,544	130,120,863.00	139,986,726.17	57,141	39,085
1895.....	970,524	130,048,365.00	139,507,788.98	45,361	39,185
1896.....	970,678	129,485,587.00	138,215,174.08	42,244	40,374
1897.....	976,014	129,795,428.00	139,949,717.35	50,585	50,101
1898.....	993,714	130,968,465.00	144,651,879.80	48,732	52,648
1899.....	991,519	131,617,961.00	138,335,052.95	53,881	37,077
1900.....	993,529	131,534,544.00	138,462,130.65	51,964	40,645
1901.....	997,735	131,568,216.00	138,531,483.84	58,373	44,898
1902.....	999,446	132,152,800.00	137,094,267.99	47,965	40,173
1903.....	996,545	133,029,030.00	137,759,653.71	52,325	40,136
1904.....	994,762	134,130,203.00	141,093,571.00	55,794	44,236
1905.....	998,441	136,745,295.00	141,142,861.33	52,841	50,027
1906.....	985,971	136,237,749.00	139,000,288.25	37,212	34,974
1907.....	967,371	140,850,880.60	138,155,412.46	43,619	29,945
1908.....	951,687	159,495,701.00	153,093,086.27	46,619	37,691
1909.....	946,194	160,682,570.32	161,978,703.50	35,789	45,086
1910.....	921,083	158,332,391.82	159,974,056.08	31,777	28,027
1911.....	892,068	154,834,237.80	157,325,160.35	30,601	25,519
1912.....	860,294	151,558,141.40	152,986,105.22	27,892	22,777
1913.....	820,200	171,490,784.52	174,171,660.80	27,856	19,346

The first payments made on new certificates each year for the past five years, with the averages, and the averages of first payments by classes during the past year are shown in the commissioner's report as follows:

First payments during the last five years.

Fiscal year.	Number.	Amount.	Average.
1913.....	433,995	\$18,250,225	\$42.05
1912.....	78,781	4,096,502	53.00
1911.....	93,632	4,842,925	51.72
1910.....	91,448	4,858,504	52.13
1909.....	124,634	6,489,416	52.07

Average first payments in each class.

Average value of first payments:	
In original cases.....	\$88.78
In original Regular Establishment cases.....	104.46
In original act May 11, 1912, cases.....	74.47
In original act Feb. 6, 1907, cases.....	192.98
In original general law, Civil War cases.....	136.45
In original act June 27, 1890, cases.....	261.20
In original act Apr. 19, 1908, cases.....	62.53
In original War with Spain cases.....	254.90
In increase and reissue cases.....	39.83
In original War with Mexico cases.....	150.03
In original Indian wars cases.....	192.54
In all cases.....	42.05

REFERENCES.

Navy pension fund: Section 4753 of the Revised Statutes provides that Navy pensions shall be paid out of the "Navy pension fund," upon an appropriation by Congress, so far as the same may be sufficient.

The naval pension fund at present amounts to \$14,000,000, bearing interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and is created under the provisions of sections 4751 and 4752 of the Revised Statutes.

The payments on account of Navy pensions during the fiscal year 1913 aggregated \$0,021,684.84.

Number of pensioners in each State and Territory, each insular possession, and each foreign country on the rolls June 30, 1913, and the amounts paid therein during the fiscal year 1913.

[Report of Commissioner of Pensions, p. 27.]

State or Territory.	Number.	Amount.	Country.	Number.	Amount.
Alabama.....	3,230	\$685,825.90	INSULAR POSSESSIONS.		
Alaska.....	80	16,986.40			
Arizona.....	895	190,035.35			
Arkansas.....	8,808	1,870,202.64	Canal Zone.....	2	\$424.66
California.....	28,964	6,149,923.12	Guam.....	3	636.99
Colorado.....	8,049	1,709,044.17	Hawaii.....	84	17,835.72
Connecticut.....	10,003	2,123,938.99	Philippines.....	70	14,863.10
Delaware.....	2,001	552,270.33	Porto Rico.....	44	9,342.52
District of Columbia.....	8,986	1,907,997.38	Total.....	203	43,102.99
Florida.....	5,085	1,079,698.05	FOREIGN COUNTRIES.		
Georgia.....	2,906	635,928.35			
Idaho.....	2,245	476,681.85			
Illinois.....	56,482	11,992,823.05			
Indiana.....	49,987	10,613,739.71	Argentina.....	13	\$2,760.29
Iowa.....	27,821	5,907,232.98	Australia.....	101	21,445.33
Kansas.....	32,399	6,879,279.67	Austria - Hungary.....	37	7,856.21
Kentucky.....	21,350	4,535,245.50			
Louisiana.....	5,373	1,140,849.09	Belgium.....	23	4,883.59
Maine.....	14,261	3,028,038.13	Canada.....	2,879	611,298.07
Maryland.....	12,439	2,641,172.87	Chile.....	11	2,335.63
Massachusetts.....	34,124	7,245,548.92	China.....	15	3,184.95
Michigan.....	34,298	7,282,494.34	Cuba.....	61	12,952.13
Minnesota.....	12,703	2,697,227.99	Denmark.....	56	11,890.48
Mississippi.....	4,009	851,230.97	England.....	555	117,843.15
Missouri.....	39,490	8,284,911.70	France.....	76	16,137.08
Montana.....	2,364	501,948.12	Germany.....	520	110,411.60
Nebraska.....	14,364	3,049,008.12	Ireland.....	404	85,781.32
Nevada.....	399	84,719.67	Italy.....	58	12,315.14
New Hampshire.....	6,560	1,392,384.80	Japan.....	33	7,006.89
New Jersey.....	20,624	4,372,083.92	Mexico.....	136	28,878.88
New Mexico.....	1,896	402,577.68	New Zealand.....	14	2,972.62
New York.....	68,270	14,408,319.71	Norway.....	73	15,500.09
North Carolina.....	3,631	770,970.23	Peru.....	12	2,547.96
North Dakota.....	2,931	622,339.23	Russia.....	16	3,397.28
Ohio.....	77,599	16,479,146.29	Scotland.....	75	15,924.75
Oklahoma.....	11,397	2,419,925.01	South Africa.....	10	2,123.80
Oregon.....	7,798	1,655,749.34	Sweden.....	69	14,650.77
Pennsylvania.....	75,618	16,038,520.56	Switzerland.....	66	14,013.73
Rhode Island.....	4,482	951,663.06	Wales.....	26	5,520.58
South Carolina.....	1,694	359,687.02	Other foreign countries or possessions having less than 10 pensioners each and not classified.....	156	33,123.48
South Dakota.....	5,392	1,144,883.36			
Tennessee.....	16,954	3,590,842.82			
Texas.....	8,402	1,783,096.66			
Utah.....	1,026	217,850.58			
Vermont.....	6,540	1,388,638.20			
Virginia.....	8,709	1,849,181.97			
Washington.....	9,942	2,110,984.86			
West Virginia.....	10,618	2,254,519.94			
Wisconsin.....	19,776	4,199,038.08			
Wyoming.....	839	178,144.87			
Total.....	814,502	172,950,861.51	Total.....	5,405	1,166,753.35

SUMMARY.

	Pensioners.	Payments.
Pensioners residing in States and Territories and payments to them.....	814,502	\$172,950,861.51
Pensioners residing in insular possessions and Canal Zone and payments to them.....	203	43,102.99
Pensioners residing in foreign countries and payments to them.....	5,495	1,166,753.35
Total.....	820,200	174,160,717.85
Payments by Treasury Department (Treasury settlements).....		10,942.95
Total payments on account of Army and Navy pensions, 1913.....		174,171,660.80

The number of Civil War survivors on the roll at the end of the fiscal year 1912 was 497,263, and at the end of the fiscal year 1913 was 462,379.

The number of Civil War survivors on the pension roll who died during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1912, was 33,891, and the number who died during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, was 36,064.

Disbursements for pensions and for maintenance of pension system, 1866 to 1913.

[Report of the Commissioner of Pensions, p. 9.]

Fiscal year.	Paid as pensions.	Cost, maintenance, and expenses.	Total.	Number of pensioners.
1866.....	\$15,450,549.88	\$407,165.00	\$15,857,714.88	126,722
1867.....	20,784,789.69	490,977.35	21,275,767.04	155,474
1868.....	23,101,509.36	553,020.34	23,654,529.70	169,643
1869.....	28,513,247.27	564,526.81	29,077,774.08	187,963
1870.....	29,351,488.78	600,997.86	29,952,486.64	198,686
1871.....	28,518,792.62	863,079.00	29,381,871.62	207,495
1872.....	29,732,746.81	951,253.00	30,703,999.81	232,229
1873.....	26,982,063.89	1,003,200.64	27,985,264.53	235,411
1874.....	30,206,778.99	966,794.13	31,173,573.12	236,241
1875.....	29,270,404.76	982,695.35	30,253,100.11	234,821
1876.....	27,936,209.53	1,015,078.81	28,951,288.34	232,137
1877.....	28,182,821.72	1,034,459.33	29,217,281.05	232,104
1878.....	26,786,009.44	1,032,500.09	27,818,509.53	223,998
1879.....	33,664,428.92	837,734.14	34,502,163.06	242,755
1880.....	56,689,229.08	935,027.28	57,624,256.36	256,802
1881.....	50,583,405.35	1,072,059.64	51,655,464.99	268,830
1882.....	54,313,172.05	1,466,236.01	55,779,408.06	283,697
1883.....	60,427,573.81	2,591,648.29	63,019,222.10	303,658
1884.....	57,912,387.47	2,835,181.00	60,747,568.47	322,756
1885.....	65,171,937.12	3,392,576.34	68,564,513.46	345,125
1886.....	64,091,142.90	3,245,016.61	67,336,159.51	365,783
1887.....	73,752,997.08	3,753,400.91	77,506,397.99	406,007
1888.....	78,950,501.67	3,515,057.27	82,465,558.94	432,557
1889.....	88,842,720.58	3,466,968.40	92,309,688.98	489,725
1890.....	106,093,850.39	3,526,382.13	109,620,232.52	537,944
1891.....	117,312,690.50	4,700,636.44	122,013,326.94	676,160
1892.....	139,394,147.11	4,898,665.80	144,292,812.91	876,068
1893.....	156,906,637.94	4,897,734.42	161,734,372.36	966,012
1894.....	139,986,726.17	3,963,976.31	143,950,702.48	969,544
1895.....	139,812,294.30	4,338,020.21	144,150,314.51	970,524
1896.....	138,220,704.46	3,991,375.61	142,212,080.07	970,678
1897.....	139,949,717.35	3,987,783.07	143,937,500.42	976,014
1898.....	144,651,879.80	4,114,091.46	148,765,971.26	993,714
1899.....	138,355,052.95	4,147,517.73	142,502,570.68	991,519
1900.....	138,462,130.65	3,841,706.74	142,303,837.39	993,592
1901.....	138,531,483.84	3,868,795.44	142,400,279.28	997,735
1902.....	137,504,267.99	3,831,378.96	141,335,646.95	999,446
1903.....	137,759,653.71	3,993,216.79	141,752,870.50	996,545
1904.....	141,093,571.49	3,849,366.25	144,942,937.74	994,762
1905.....	141,142,861.33	3,721,832.82	144,864,694.15	998,441
1906.....	139,000,288.25	3,523,269.51	142,523,557.76	985,971
1907.....	138,155,412.46	3,309,110.44	141,464,522.90	967,371
1908.....	153,093,086.27	2,800,963.36	155,894,049.63	951,687
1909.....	161,973,703.77	2,852,583.73	164,826,287.50	946,194
1910.....	159,974,056.08	2,657,673.86	162,631,729.94	921,083
1911.....	157,325,160.35	2,517,127.06	159,842,287.41	892,098
1912.....	152,986,483.72	2,448,857.31	155,435,341.03	860,294
1913.....	174,171,660.80	2,543,246.59	176,714,907.39	820,200
Total.....	4,461,094,380.45	125,871,965.64	4,586,966,346.09

SPECIAL ACTS.

[Report of Commissioner of Pensions, p. 9.]

Since 1861 there have been allowed by special acts of Congress 42,337 pensions and increases of pensions, of which 22,016 are now on the roll, with an annual face value of \$6,699,096. Only a part of this is properly chargeable to special acts, as most of the beneficiaries had been previously pensioned under general laws at lower rates.

From June 30, 1912, and thereafter during the Sixty-second Congress, 2,871 persons were included in the special acts passed at the rates specified in the summary following:

Pensions granted by special act during the Sixty-second Congress subsequent to June 30, 1912.

Rates specified.	Number granted.	Rates specified.	Number granted.	Rates specified.	Number granted.
\$100.....	3	\$20.....	398	Inoperative:	
\$50.....	98	\$18.....	6	\$50.....	8
\$46.....	1	\$17.....	6	\$40.....	4
\$45.....	2	\$16.....	32	\$36.....	9
\$40.....	116	\$15.....	20	\$30.....	33
\$36.....	164	\$14.....	2	\$24.....	16
\$35.....	2	\$12.....	403	\$20.....	3
\$30.....	972	\$10.....	15	\$16.....	4
\$25.....	16	\$8.....	9	\$12.....	4
\$24.....	518	\$6.....	7		
				Total.....	2,871

Of the above, 461 were granted to persons not in receipt of a pension and 2,410 to persons then receiving smaller pensions.

The annual value of said special-act pensions is \$864,624, and the annual increase due to the same is \$407,157.

The following statement shows the number of pensions and increases of pensions granted by special acts during each Congress since March 4, 1861:

Number of pensions granted by special acts each Congress since Mar. 4, 1861.

Congress.	Number.	Congress.	Number.
Thirty-seventh (1861-1863).....	12	Fifty-first (1889-1891).....	1,388
Thirty-eighth (1863-1865).....	27	Fifty-second (1891-1893).....	217
Thirty-ninth (1865-1867).....	138	Fifty-third (1893-1895).....	110
Fortieth (1867-1869).....	275	Fifty-fourth (1895-1897).....	378
Forty-first (1869-1871).....	85	Fifty-fifth (1897-1899).....	694
Forty-second (1871-1873).....	167	Fifty-sixth (1899-1901).....	1,391
Forty-third (1873-1875).....	182	Fifty-seventh (1901-1903).....	2,171
Forty-fourth (1875-1877).....	98	Fifty-eighth (1903-1905).....	3,355
Forty-fifth (1877-1879).....	230	Fifty-ninth (1905-1907).....	6,030
Forty-sixth (1879-1881).....	96	Sixtieth (1907-1909).....	6,600
Forty-seventh (1881-1883).....	216	Sixty-first (1909-1911).....	9,649
Forty-eighth (1883-1885).....	598	Sixty-second (1911-1913).....	6,350
Forty-ninth (1885-1887).....	856		
Fiftieth (1887-1889).....	1,015	Total.....	42,337

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, before the passage of the Underwood tariff bill it was generally known that the rates would be reduced, and many importers ordered and purchased goods and produce for delivery after the passage of the legislation. The bill itself became a law on the 3d day of October, 1913, and for the next two or three months imports were exceedingly heavy.

I intend this afternoon to call your attention to some of the importations during the four months following its enactment—October, November, and December of 1913 and January of 1914—one-third of a year. I take it that I will not underestimate the importations for the year if I assume that they will be three times as great as the amount received during those four months, and upon that basis I have made some calculations to which I invite your attention.

Now, gentlemen, I suppose no political party can frame a tariff bill that will be satisfactory in all particulars to all of the people of the United States, or even satisfactory to all the members of the party fashioning it. There are things in the recent tariff bill objectionable to me. The bill was made for the entire country—for the West and the East and the South and the North.

The State of Minnesota differs in many respects from other States. It has different interests, and naturally they appeal strongly to one who comes from that State. For instance, during the last three years, both in quantity and in value, more than one-half of all the iron ore produced and marketed in the United States came from the State of Minnesota. It by far outranks any other State in the production of iron ore.

Minnesota, too, is a great agricultural State, not so great as the greatest agricultural State of all, Illinois, but a State that ranks high. I notice that in the production of oats last year Illinois stood first; Iowa, second; Minnesota, third; in the production of wheat North Dakota stood first; Kansas, second; and Minnesota, third; in the production of barley Minnesota stood first.

I speak of these things simply to indicate the importance that a representative from Minnesota may attach to the particular things in which that State is so prominent. It has been called the bread-and-butter State of the Union. Its flour, from which the bread is made, is sold all over the world, and its dairy butter is famous throughout the country. The largest flour mill in the world is located in the metropolis of the State—the Pillsbury A flour mill, with a capacity of 15,000 barrels a day, and actually making 11,000 barrels of flour every day. One-fourth of the entire flour output of the United States goes out of the city of Minneapolis. I spoke of its being the leading State in the production of barley. The enormous amount of 49,727,130 bushels of that cereal were produced there in 1913; more than the total production of Canada.

I said that the tariff bill was made for no particular State, but for all of the States of the Union. Of course there were a great many people who were dissatisfied with it because some privilege or some benefit or some favor that they had enjoyed under former tariff laws had been taken away. Some of us may have unduly exaggerated its importance because it was a measure of our political party. Others were bound to find fault with it, bound to quarrel with it, because it was a measure of our party and not of theirs. It has its enemies; and while I would not charge anyone, no matter how partisan he

may be, with desiring panics, hard times, and business depression in order that some political advantage may be worked out of them, I can not but believe that the persistent attempts to decry the bill and to misrepresent its effects cause apprehension and distrust throughout the country, and apprehension and distrust usually breed industrial stagnation and disaster.

Out through the Northwest it has been stated repeatedly that it is a bill which discriminates against the North and favors the South. I take it no one really believes that the persons who made the bill attempted to favor any particular section of the country or attempted to injure any section of it.

An examination of the items of the bill gives little color for any such charge. For instance—and I shall refer to this but briefly, for I have other matters to discuss—an effort was made to put upon the free list the things entering into the production of manufactured products—the raw materials. Raw silk is not produced in this country. It is on the free list. Cotton in the South and wool in the North are on the free list. Flax in the North and hemp in the South have been treated just alike. They are on the free list. Iron ore produced in the North and in the South, lumber on the Pacific coast and in the South, and cattle raised in the West, the North, and the South were put upon the free list. The barley of Minnesota and the rice of Louisiana were treated just the same, the duty being reduced 50 per cent. The potatoes of Maine and the sweet potatoes of the South were treated exactly the same.

Not all of those who opposed tariff reduction gave themselves over to denunciation, however. It gives me pleasure to read here to-day the words of one who was perhaps as much opposed to the present tariff law as any one in this Chamber, and who is not converted yet. He accepted it as an American business man and patriotic citizen should accept it. I read what William M. Wood, head of the American Woolen Co., said concerning this tariff bill after its passage. He was opposed to it, is opposed to it to-day, but I commend to you the spirit in which he received the enactment of the American Congress:

OPTIMISTIC.

We have a new tariff. All criticism of the bill, pro and con, is of the past. The matter is settled—it is as desired by the majority—it is the law.

American people are accustomed to taking conditions as they find them and forcing their way to success. Our forefathers hewed the forests, quarried the rock, and dammed the streams. Their sons developed the land, raised their livestock, and manufactured what was required for their simple needs. Succeeding generations tilled the soil, worked the mines, and manufactured goods to a degree never before known to man.

American industry typifies a genius which has no equal throughout the world.

To excel in manufacture is a birthright handed down to every American by his forefathers—and to-day, with conditions changed, with temporary annoyances balking our endeavors, we mean to claim our birthright.

Now, after words such as these, it is refreshing to read this news item under date of March 26, 1914:

WOOLEN MILLS BOOM UNDER LOWER TARIFF.

BOSTON, March 25.

The American Woolen Co.'s gross business thus far this year is nearly twice that of a year ago, and although the prices named on its goods to stimulate this activity have been very close, the outlook is more promising than at any time since the new tariff came into being. It is noticeable that the bulk of 1914 orders has been of staples which form the output of the big Lawrence mills.

[Applause.]

When you find a man who does not like tariff reduction, but realizes that it is the law of the land, and instead of barking and howling about it says, "I will do the best I can under it," it is pleasant to learn of his success and to hear that his business has nearly doubled.

Another thing that has been said about this tariff bill is that it discriminates against the farmer of the country, and that he suffers greatly because of it. Early in March of this year the steamship *Empress of Asia* brought 12,000 cases of eggs from China to Vancouver. Six thousand cases were consigned to San Francisco and 6,000 to Vancouver. During the months preceding there had been importations of eggs from China, and although I have made no investigation I believe there were few eggs imported from that country prior to the passage of the tariff act. This was not on account of the amount of the tariff duty, but because it was a specific duty. The eggs exported from China are very small and inferior. They command a low price in the market. Sixty per cent of them go to Germany. Our duty upon eggs was a specific duty of 5 cents a dozen; it made no difference whether the eggs were large and fair or whether they were small and inferior. The very duty itself, because it was a specific duty, discriminated against the poorer product. Had the duty of 5 cents a dozen been changed to 30 per cent ad valorem Chinese eggs would have come in here, because then there would have been no discrimination. Five cents a dozen on eggs worth 10 cents a dozen is 50 per cent

ad valorem; on eggs worth 20 cents a dozen only 25 per cent ad valorem. But the Payne-Aldrich tariff men thought they could make capital out of these importations of eggs. There went up a cry throughout the country "China with its millions of people, and presumably billions of hens, is attacking the United States egg market, and the American hen will be driven out of business." Not long after that the Philadelphia Public Ledger, on April 17 of this year, announced the loss by the western farmer of the corn trade in the East.

The article stated that the seaboard markets are either chock-full of corn from Argentina or that corn is coming in in large amounts. We produce in the United States 75 per cent of all the corn raised in the world, and yet because corn comes here from Argentina they tell us our corn trade is ruined. Argentina with a total population less than twice the population of a single American city. They will send their corn here and drive our farmers out of business. We are told that chilled or frozen beef is coming into the United States from Argentina at the rate of 9,000,000 pounds monthly. What a wonderful country that is, sending corn here to destroy our corn market and sending beef here to destroy our beef market.

Now, we do not export a large percentage of our corn, even though twice as many bushels as Argentina will send here. We feed it to steers, and market corn-fed beef. There is nothing better on the market. In Argentina they do not do it that way. They ship the corn—practically all of it—they do not themselves eat, and feed their cattle on alfalfa. We are in no serious danger from the competition of alfalfa-fed cattle against corn-fed cattle.

But I have some figures. I may as well confine myself to these three things—eggs, corn, and beef. Eggs carried a duty of 5 cents a dozen; now they are on the free list. Corn, 15 cents a bushel; now on the free list. Beef, 1½ cents a pound; also on the free list. On these products the duty was entirely removed. Wheat, from a duty of 25 cents a bushel, was reduced to 10 cents a bushel. Potatoes, from a duty of 25 cents a bushel, was reduced to 10 per cent ad valorem. Oats, from a duty of 15 cents a bushel, was reduced to 6 cents a bushel. Barley, from a duty of 30 cents a bushel, was reduced to 15 cents a bushel. Cleaned rice, from a duty of 2 cents a pound, was reduced to 1 cent a pound. Butter, from a duty of 6 cents, was reduced to 2½ cents. So I have selected the three that are on the free list where the greatest importations might be expected.

I am particularly struck with the fact that nearly all these dreaded importations come from Argentina. The Argentine Republic, with a large area, about one-third of the United States, has an approximate population of seven and a half million people. Thirty thousand of them are Indians and one million and a quarter of them live in one large city, the capital, Buenos Aires, where the cost of living is higher, I am informed, than in any other place in the western world. How many of the remainder of this population are farmers I do not know, but there are numerous cities and towns. The agricultural population is not very large. Do you think they can capture the American markets?

Now, gentlemen, we endeavored to make what is called a competitive tariff, and by a competitive tariff we mean one that will permit the importation into the markets of this country of things that will compete with things produced in this country but sold in noncompetitive markets. If a dozen men or a dozen corporations control the output of an article, and they make an agreement to sell it at a certain price, there is no competition, and we ought to have importations from abroad, if we can get them, in order to secure competition, so that there may be a fair and competitive market in which the American consumer can trade.

We admit that wherever prices are controlled by combinations or agreements or by monopoly and we can bring in like products from other countries uncontrolled by any such agreement or monopoly, there will be a tendency toward price reduction. But where we have competition at home, where there is strong domestic competition, then the importation of other products from abroad will not materially affect the prices unless the quantity is so great as to create an oversupply.

The farmers of this country are in no combination; they have no agreement; they constitute no monopoly; they are competitors and always have been competitors and always will be competitors. A man who raises wheat or who raises corn or who brings eggs to the market is in no combination, and he sells under no agreement as to price. There is full and free competition, and the price at which he sells is not affected by the increase or the decrease of importations unless such increase or decrease be large enough either to create an oversupply or to bring about a scarcity.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. I will.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota to the fact that American beef this spring is as high as it has been for several years past, notwithstanding the importation of Argentine beef.

Mr. HAMMOND. I am going to give to the House what seems to me to be an absolute demonstration that the prices of beef and of farm products are higher this spring than one year ago.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks that is a fair comparison?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Take, for instance, corn. We had last year only about a three-quarters crop, and, as the gentleman well knows, when there is a shortage of a crop as a general rule it is followed by an increase in the price of that article. For instance, in Kansas last year they produced 23,000,000 bushels of corn. If it sold at 60 cents a bushel, that would mean \$13,000,000. The year before they produced 180,000,000 bushels of corn, which, if sold at 60 cents, would have yielded them more than \$100,000,000. Does the gentleman think that the farmers of Kansas ought to be satisfied last year with \$13,000,000 for the corn crop when they had \$100,000,000 the year before?

Mr. HAMMOND. Permit me to answer. There was a shortage of the corn crop last year, a shortage so great that it would take 30 years of the Argentine importations to make it up. The gentleman's reasoning is very good, but let me tell the gentleman that during the same year we did not have a shortage in the wheat crop, but we had a bumper crop, and the price of wheat is higher than it was a year ago. There is no shortage about that. Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Pardon me for calling attention to the Democratic platform, which has been somewhat discredited lately in spots, but was it not a declaration of that platform that protection was the cause of high prices and that you proposed to reduce high prices by reducing duties?

Mr. HAMMOND. I think I understand the gentleman's question. The Democrats have always claimed that the prices to the consumer would be reduced somewhat by the reduction of tariff duties.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But they have not been so reduced.

Mr. HAMMOND. I will come to that in just a moment, if the gentleman will wait.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have taken occasion to make an investigation of the prices on 12 leading farm articles for the last 10 years in the markets of Chicago and New York, and of those 12 leading farm articles for 10 years, on the 1st day of March 9 of them are higher this 1st day of March than they have been any time in the last 10 years. I shall put that in the RECORD as soon as I have an opportunity.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the gentleman intends to do that. I come to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] now. The question may be asked, in view of what I said, How is it that the farmers can get better prices for all of their products and still the high cost of living be reduced?

Mr. Chairman, I have stated our purpose was to write a competitive tariff bill, a bill that would restore competition where there is no competition. We do not expect, and can not expect by competition, to reduce prices where there is competition now, but we might expect that there would be a reduction of prices where there is no competition. There is a vast difference between the amount the farmer receives for his product and the amount the ultimate consumer pays for the same product. I think it was a Senator from North Dakota who made an estimate not very many years ago that, according to the prices charged to you and to me in the restaurant in this building, a \$75 steer would bring about \$2,000. Where market men get together and fix the prices to be charged the consumer of farm products, we hope by importation of products from abroad to beat the combination and make the price less to the man who has to buy. That does not affect the price at which the farmer sells.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Referring to the question of the importation of beef from Argentina, the gentleman stated it was about 9,000,000 pounds per month?

Mr. HAMMOND. It has been so stated.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That would be about 100,000,000 pounds of beef per year?

Mr. HAMMOND. I do not know how long it is intended to keep it up.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That would be 1 pound per annum for each person in the United States?

Mr. HAMMOND. That is a mathematical computation. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman think that would seriously reduce the price of beef to the consumer? Is that sufficient competition, in the gentleman's judgment, to reduce the price to the consumer?

Mr. HAMMOND. No; it is not sufficient competition to reduce the price materially to the consumer; neither is it sufficient competition or importation upon which the opponents of tariff reduction can base a claim that we are upon the verge of ruin because of importations from Argentina.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Did not your Democratic President hold out to the people who live in cities the prospect of cheaper commodities to go into the market basket?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Was not that the constant argument in the last campaign; and did you not, therefore, pursuant to that policy, reduce duties on farm products in order to make the things that go into the market basket cheaper?

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I will state again to the gentleman, as I have stated several times, that we endeavored to make a competitive tariff bill, a bill that would bring competition where no competition existed, a bill that would not seriously affect the prices for which our products were sold in markets where competition did exist.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. One more question and then I shall not trouble the gentleman further. Does not the gentleman concede that the importation of Argentine corn, some of which has already gone to Chicago, the very heart of the corn belt, some of which has already gone to Oklahoma—does not the gentleman concede that the importation of this corn must force down the price of corn to the western farmer?

Mr. HAMMOND. No; I do not concede that. I answer the gentleman somewhat abruptly, if he will pardon me, simply because I wish to hurry on.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that only one carload of corn has reached Chicago, and that was sent there for experimental purposes, to see if it could be fed to chickens?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, 240,000 bushels of corn have—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must first get permission of the gentleman who has the floor. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HAMMOND. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I asked the gentleman to permit me to interpose at this place this statement in answer to the chicken-feed suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], that already 240,000 bushels of Argentine corn has been contracted for to arrive in Chicago by way of Montreal, and that corn has also—

Mr. RAINEY. I said that only one carload has gone there.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman should first address the Chair, as the Chair is insisting upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when he rapped for order he was trying to prevent the gentleman from Illinois from interrupting the gentleman from Minnesota without permission.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I thank the Chair for his consideration.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Right along the line of the gentleman's answer to another question, in Cedar County, Iowa, a farmer wrote me that he had been offered 65 cents a bushel for his corn in the field early in November. In December, after notice had been published of the importations of large quantities of Argentine corn, he hauled it to town and sold it for 53 cents a bushel. He

did not sell for 65 because he thought it was going to 75. Now, I would like to have the gentleman tell me why corn dropped that much in the course of a month in the face of the great shortage of the corn crop in the State of Iowa, if it was not due to the importation of corn from Argentina.

Mr. HAMMOND. The gentleman knows as well as I do that prices fluctuate from month to month. I have here a list of prices, and I think the gentleman sold his corn perhaps fairly well. I notice in a little country market—

Mr. GOOD. He did not think so.

Mr. HAMMOND. Well, I can not help that. I notice in a little country market in Minnesota the price of corn the 6th of March was 50 cents; on the 20th of March it was 53 cents. Now, I do not suppose any news had reached that market of the loss of a cargo of corn bound from Argentina to the United States, and that the reported loss of such a cargo caused corn to go up 3 cents. Markets fluctuate, but not on account of Argentine activity. The prices of farm products are much better since this tariff law went into effect than before. I am not going to deal in buncombe. I do not claim the tariff has made farm prices better, but I do claim that it has not affected them.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman a question—

Mr. HAMMOND. I think I will have to decline to yield to the gentleman. I am very sorry.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Very well.

Mr. HAMMOND. The Payne-Aldrich tariff advocates say when importations come into this country the supply is greater and the price is less. I will grant you that importations of any product would naturally decrease the price.

If, first, there is but one market for the domestic product, because if there are dozens of other markets then the product will find the market where the demand exists. If Argentina, for instance, should, instead of exporting her products to the countries of Europe, send them all here, then the countries of Europe would find some market in which to purchase the things formerly obtained from Argentina. Increased importations may reduce the price if there is but one market in which to sell the commodity. If, second, the supply is very largely increased—I might carry a cupful of water from Lake Champlain and throw it into Lake Superior. It would increase the amount of water in Lake Superior, but the result would not be appreciable. It would not affect navigation of the lake, and so it is true that infinitesimal importations are not going to affect prices. If, third, the demand or the consumption is not correspondingly increased, of course if there is a greater demand in the country than there was formerly, then the importations would not affect prices; they would simply meet the demand.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. In just a moment. Will the chairman of the committee give me 15 minutes more?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; I will yield 15 minutes additional to the gentleman. I believe I told the gentleman that if it was needed I would give him an hour.

Mr. HAMMOND. I will now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. As I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON], he complains that 240,000 bushels of corn are threatened to be imported into Chicago. That would be, upon the basis of about 3,000,000 of population which the city of Chicago has, a little over a quart of corn to each inhabitant of Chicago. I wish to ask the gentleman if he thinks that that quart of corn to each inhabitant would glut the market and decrease the price of corn?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan rose.

Mr. HAMMOND. I must decline to yield. I will answer the question of the gentleman from Kentucky by saying that I think—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I really would enjoy answering—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HAMMOND. I do not think that we will be seriously affected by the importation of corn from Argentina.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield for just one remark?

Mr. HAMMOND. I will.

Mr. RAINEY. I want to say I have investigated the question of the shipment of Argentine corn to Chicago, and it costs 22 cents a bushel for freight alone to ship from the upper Plate corn from the Argentine Republic to Chicago. I have investigated the question, and I find this feed store over on the

corner, which is the largest in the city, reports that they can not bring Argentine corn here and sell it as cheaply as they can bring in Ohio yellow corn, and this market in Washington is supplied at the present time with Ohio yellow corn cheaper than it can be brought from Argentina.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. I will yield now.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Concerning first the observation of the gentleman—

Mr. HAMMOND. I can not yield for a statement.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Then I will ask the gentleman a question. Is it not true that the water rate on corn from Argentina to New York is from 5 to 7½ cents a bushel?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes; I think so.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And the water rate on corn from Argentina to Chicago by way of Montreal is a little over 7 cents instead of being 24 cents. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is just the same sort of a lightning calculator as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS]. Is it not true, also, that this Argentine corn has taken all the New England market away from the corn growers of the West, and that the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has made a new freight rate from tidewater to New England ports? And is it not true that for several months past little corn has gone from the corn belt to New York? And is it not true, further, that the Corn Products Co. is buying 75 per cent of the Argentine corn?

Mr. HAMMOND. The gentleman is in error as to the rate from Argentina to Chicago. Argentine corn has not captured the New England markets. I can not remember all his questions, but with the exception of his first statement in reference to the rate from Argentina to New York the statements are incorrect.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And that is the only one you undertake to answer?

Mr. HAMMOND. I state that they are not so, and I know of no other way to answer incorrect statements.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Have you any figures with which to refute them?

Mr. HAMMOND. I have them; yes.

I proposed taking up as well as I might three things—eggs, corn, and beef. I am trying to be fair about this. I am assuming that the importations for the first four months after the tariff passed, for the reasons I have given, are as large or larger than they will be in any other four months of the year. So in calculating the importations for a year I have multiplied the amount for the four months by three. We imported in October, November, December, 1913, and January, 1914, 2,885,561 dozen eggs into this country. They were worth \$612,759. At the same rate for the year the total value of our importations would be \$1,838,277. Now, we exported in 1912 \$3,395,953 worth. Our exports of eggs, therefore, are double our imports. The average price paid for the eggs we exported in 1912, the average price paid to us, was 22 cents a dozen, and the average import price on eggs brought into the United States was 13.7 cents a dozen. I submit there is not very much harm in importing eggs at about 14 cents a dozen if we can export twice as many at 22 cents a dozen.

But a little more in connection with this matter. The consumption of eggs in the United States in 1910 was an amount valued at \$320,739,375. The imports for this year are about one-half of 1 per cent of our consumption. I said a little while ago that I could put more water in Lake Superior by carrying a cupful from Lake Champlain, but it would not materially affect Lake Superior. Now, gentlemen, do you think, with our consumption of \$320,000,000 worth of a product, we are going to be seriously affected by importations of one-half of 1 per cent? Why, we produced in the United States in 1910 1,591,000,000 dozens of eggs. In 1900, 10 years before, we produced 1,293,000,000 dozens of eggs. The gain in 10 years was 297,000,000 dozens; and during that period the State of Missouri alone, which produced more eggs than any other State in 1910, gained in production 26,613,403 dozens. The 26,000,000 dozens gained in the State of Missouri in 10 years is a greater number than the total exports of eggs from China to the entire world, and 60 per cent of those exports go to the German Empire.

In the course of marketing eggs in the United States three-tenths of them are damaged from bad handling and one-tenth are broken; that is, one egg out of every ten is broken; and we can not do what the king and all his men could not do—we can not put it together again. It is lost. If the American people would exercise a little more care and, instead of breaking as many eggs as they break now, would break only half as many we would save each year 79,000,000 dozen eggs, and it would take nine years for the importations of eggs coming from China and from all other places to this country to make up that number.

Now, in reference to corn. The total corn importations in October, November, and December, 1913, and January, 1914, were 7,034,159 bushels. That would make for a year 21,102,477 bushels. Our exports in 1912, including corn meal, were 41,797,291 bushels; so our exports are just about double our imports. In 1912 we had an enormous production—3,124,746,000 bushels. But while that production was enormous, it was not abnormal. Our exports and our imports combined are only about 2 per cent of that production.

The importations are about two-thirds of 1 per cent, so we are in no immediate danger of having our markets taken away from us. A gentleman asked me if it is not true that certain markets—I do not remember where they were—had been taken away from the western farmer by the Argentine corn. What nonsense! Taken away by some portion of two-thirds of 1 per cent. Of course it is not true. The statement is based upon some such article as that which appeared in the Philadelphia Ledger, stating that the seaboard markets are chock full of corn and more is on the way.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] spoke about the corn shortage. Our shortage in 1913 was 677,748,000 bushels, a tremendous amount. But even with that shortage the United States of America produced 68 per cent of all the corn raised in the world.

In North and South America there are 130,000,000 acres of land planted to corn—105,000,000 in the United States, 13,000,000 in Mexico, and 10,000,000 in Argentina.

Argentine corn brings a less price in our markets than does American corn. I am told that it responds to chemical tests and is good corn. But in our country we like the yellow dent corn. It looks the best. I believe it is the best. Anyway it commands a price in the market that the Argentine corn does not often reach. Argentine corn is largely of the flint variety.

That is not alone true in the United States. We have been sending our corn to Great Britain and Argentina has been sending its corn to Great Britain, one the competitor of the other, and three years out of five the American corn brought the better price.

Before I refer to the importations of beef, let me say a word concerning wheat: Notwithstanding the statements industriously circulated by those who desire to create a prejudice among the farmers against the present tariff law, and who do not hesitate to use misrepresentations in their attempts to arouse such prejudice, wheat imported into this country is subject to a duty of 10 cents a bushel, except wheat from Argentina. Russia, including Asiatic Russia, is the greatest wheat-raising nation of the world, but should any of its product come to American ports a duty of 10 cents a bushel would be levied upon it. The Canadian wheat crop is, perhaps, one-third of our own, and the wheat raised in Western Canada is of excellent quality. During the past year, much of the time, the Canadian price was better than our own. Just how they compare now I can not say, but, generally speaking, the Minneapolis price is better than the Winnipeg price. American farmers, as a general thing, receive a better price for their wheat than do their Canadian neighbors. The difference in price, or the spread between the markets, is less than 10 cents a bushel, save in exceptional cases, but the Canadians can not bring their wheat into our markets without paying a duty of 10 cents a bushel on it. The tariff law levies a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat imported into this country from any country that imposes a duty upon wheat or products of wheat imported from this country into it. Now, under this provision wheat might be imported free of duty into the United States from Finland, the Netherlands, Denmark, Great Britain, and Argentina. The wheat raisers of this country were told that so valuable is the American market that the Canadian Government would hasten to remove all of its duties on wheat and wheat products, so that it might send its wheat free of duty into the United States. In a speech by me in April, 1913, in support of the present tariff law, I said:

But certain gentlemen say: "Do not you know that just the moment this bill becomes a law Canada, through her governor general or some other official who has the power, with one stroke of the pen will strike out the duty now imposed on American flour, so that Canadian flour may come into the United States?" No, Mr. Chairman; we do not know it, nor does anyone else know it, but those acquainted with the history of recent tariff enactments have good reason to believe that Canada will do nothing of the kind.

Mr. Collins, the editor of an agricultural paper published in Minnesota, who champions the Payne-Aldrich tariff law and loses no opportunity to make statements he thinks may discredit the present tariff law, in a letter written to the American Economist—the organ of high protection—under date of December 27, 1913, stated:

There is not one chance in a million of Canada's failing to remove her tariff on American grain, since it is protection only on paper and

not in reality, for, of course, we are not sending American grain over into Saskatchewan or Manitoba.

We might send wheat into Saskatchewan and Manitoba, but it would not ruin the Canadian wheat market if we did. So Argentina may send some wheat to the United States, but it would not ruin the American wheat market if it does.

But to continue with Canada. On January 30 of this year a free-wheat amendment was proposed to the address in reply to the speech from the throne in the Canadian Parliament and was defeated by a vote of 102 to 57. This was in the nature of a test vote and clearly indicated that the Canadians had no intention of removing their tariff duties in order to send wheat into the United States. On April 7 of this year the minister of finance of the Canadian Government made his annual budget statement, and the proposition to remove the duty on wheat and wheat products was finally rejected. So unless there is a decided change of opinion in Canada wheat coming from the Dominion into the United States will pay a tariff duty of 10 cents a bushel.

So free-wheat importations must come from Argentina. The wheat crop of Argentina for 1912-13 was 198,000,000 bushels. I can not give the exports for that year, but for 1911 83,993,460 bushels were exported. The wheat production of the United States for 1912 was over 730,000,000 bushels, and for 1913 it was 763,380,000 bushels. Our exports of wheat in 1912 were 30,160,212 bushels, valued at \$28,477,584. Now, the wheat we exported was sold in the markets of the world in competition with the wheat from Argentina and wheat from other parts of the world. If we can sell over \$28,000,000 worth of this cereal in the world's markets in competition with the wheat raised in other countries, is it not reasonable to suppose we can successfully market our crop in our own markets, even though we were obliged to meet such competition? The farmer who sells his wheat does not receive any less for it because it is exported; the market price of wheat is the same whether it is retained for home consumption or is sent abroad to supply a foreign demand.

The statistical department of the Argentine ministry of agriculture gives the production cost of wheat on a farm of 618 acres, 6 miles from a railroad; 4½ acres of the farm were sowed to wheat and the balance was pasturage. The cost of production was 66 cents per bushel and the yield 15 bushels to the acre—a trifle less than the Minnesota yield for 1912, which was 15.5 bushels per acre. Farm labor in Argentina is nearly as high as it is in our wheat belt.

Of course, we may expect importations of wheat from Argentina and from Canada. We imported wheat before the enactment of the Underwood tariff bill, and we will continue to import it. Our consumption is increasing, and year by year we send less of our wheat abroad, and in the natural course of things the imports will be greater and greater as the consumption in this country increases, because the increase in production is not keeping up with the increase in consumption.

The gentleman from Iowa who referred to the shortage in the corn crop attributed the better prices of corn this year over last year to that shortage. The tables I am submitting show that wheat is selling at a better price this year than last year, and that can not be due to a wheat shortage, for we raised last year the biggest crop of wheat ever produced in this country.

The importations of wheat have not affected the price, nor have the importations of corn affected the price; that is, they have not affected the price the man who raises the wheat and the corn receives for his product. If wheat or corn in a given market place is cornered or monopolized, and the price thereby raised, then importations may tend to bring down that price. Then there will be competition where there was no competition.

Since Argentine wheat may come into this country free of duty we may look for increased importations from the southern Republic, but every bushel of the wheat, manufactured or unmanufactured, coming here, lessens Argentina's exports to other countries by just one bushel, and those other countries will seek to purchase that bushel somewhere else.

In 1911 the importations of wheat into the United Kingdom from Argentina were a little larger than from the United States, but the next year—1912—the Argentine importations, although considerably greater than the year before, were less than those from the United States. The United Kingdom must have wheat, either made into flour to feed the English people or for its great port mills, where it is made into flour. Let the importations from Argentina fall off, the greater will be the demand for American wheat; let the American supply fail, the greater will be the demand for the Argentine crop. As I said before, it matters not to the farmer, when he hauls his wheat to the elevator and receives his pay for it, whether that wheat remains in the

United States or goes out of the United States; there is always a market somewhere for the staff of life.

Potatoes, too, like wheat, are subject to duty when imported into the United States, if they come from a country that imposes duties upon potatoes imported from the United States. Canada has a tariff upon potatoes, so when imported from Canada they are subject to an ad valorem tariff charge of 10 per cent. During the first four months under the new tariff law there were imported into the United States 3,261,705 bushels of potatoes. This would indicate a total annual importation of somewhat less than 10,000,000 bushels. The advocates of special privilege, in their attacks upon the Underwood law, will try to make the farmers believe that such a tremendous importation as 10,000,000 bushels will compel them to sell their potatoes for less than heretofore, and probably some farmers will believe them; but they would take little stock in the argument of these opponents of low tariff if they knew that during the year 1912 the United States imported nearly 14,000,000 bushels of potatoes. If the farmers could prosper with so large an amount of potatoes coming in here, it is quite likely they will get along comfortably under the new tariff law with importations nearly a third less.

I now present market statements of St. James, Minn., March 7, 1913, March 6, 1914, and March 20, 1914. They are taken from a weekly paper published there.

It appears that in nearly every instance the prices are better this year than last year. These are the prices the farmer receives:

Comparative statement of market prices for March, 1913, and March, 1914, at St. James, Minn., and market prices at Slayton, Minn., for April, 1913, and April, 1914.

	St. James market.		
	Mar. 7, 1913.	Mar. 6, 1914.	Mar. 20, 1914.
Grains:			
Wheat No. 1.....	\$0.78	\$0.82	\$0.85
Wheat No. 2.....	.76	.80	.83
Wheat No. 3.....	.73	.77	.80
Oats.....	.26	.32	.32
Corn.....	.35	.50	.53
Barley.....	.40	.45	.45
Rye.....	.45	.48	.48
Flax.....	1.15	1.40	1.45
Produce:			
Eggs.....	.18	.24	.16
Dairy butter.....	.25	.25	.25
Potatoes.....	.35	.75	.75
Live stock:			
Hogs.....	\$7.40 to 7.50	\$7.90 to 8.00	\$8.00 to 8.10
Steers.....	5.25 to 7.75	5.25 to 8.00	5.25 to 8.00
Heifers.....	3.50 to 6.50	4.00 to 6.75	4.00 to 6.75
Cows.....	3.50 to 6.50	4.00 to 6.50	4.00 to 6.50
Veal.....	4.25 to 7.75	4.00 to 8.50	4.00 to 8.50
Sheep.....	4.50 to 6.25	2.50 to 4.50	2.50 to 4.50
Lambs.....	4.25 to 6.25	5.25 to 6.75	5.25 to 6.75
Poultry:			
Chickens.....	.08	.10	.10
Ducks.....	.08	.08 to .10	.08 to .10
Geese.....	.08	.07 to .11	.07 to .11
Turkeys.....	.12	.10	.10

	Slayton market.	
	Apr. 17, 1913.	Apr. —, 1914.
Grains:		
Wheat No. 1.....	(¹)	(¹)
Wheat No. 2.....	\$0.70 to \$0.73	\$0.79 to \$0.82
Wheat No. 3.....		
Oats.....	.25 to .26	.32
Corn.....	.43	.55½ to .58½
Barley.....	.40	.47
Rye.....	(¹)	(¹)
Flax.....	(¹)	(¹)
Produce:		
Eggs.....	.14	.16
Dairy butter.....	(²)	(²)
Potatoes.....	(¹)	(¹)
Live stock:		
Hogs.....	(¹)	(¹)
Steers.....	(¹)	(¹)
Heifers.....	(¹)	(¹)
Cows.....	(¹)	(¹)
Veal.....	(¹)	(¹)
Sheep.....	(¹)	(¹)
Lambs.....	(¹)	(¹)
Poultry:		
Chickens.....	(¹)	(¹)
Ducks.....	(¹)	(¹)
Geese.....	(¹)	(¹)
Turkeys.....	(¹)	(¹)

¹ Not shown on report quoted.

² Not quoted.

³ 3 cents lower than 1913.

Just a word about importations of meat. We must import meat, tariff or no tariff. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] asked me if I thought the importations of meat would reduce its cost to the consumer, and I said that I feared they would not materially reduce the cost. I had in mind importations of beef from Argentina. The export business of that country is mainly controlled by American packers. There are nine establishments for slaughtering, chilling or freezing, and exporting beef located in or near Buenos Aires; five are owned or operated by Chicago houses. We would indeed be credulous were we to believe that these Chicago-controlled companies in Argentina will bring their Argentine beef to the United States for the purpose of lowering the price of their American beef. As I have stated several times, we may look for reduced prices when importations will give us competition, but there is no competition between Chicago packers in the United States and Chicago packers in Argentina.

Why do I say, "We must have importations"? This is the reason: In 1910 there were 41,178,000 meat cattle in the United States; in January, 1914, 35,855,000. During the last four years there has been an average annual decrease of 1,330,000, or 3.3 per cent. In 1910 there were in the United States 52,448,000 sheep; in January, 1914, 49,719,000; an average annual decrease since 1910 of 682,000, or 1.3 per cent. In 1910 there were in this country 58,186,000 swine; January 1, 1914, there were 58,933,000, an increase for the four years of 1.3 per cent. Now, during that time, from 1910 to 1914, the population of the United States increased from 91,972,000 to 98,646,000. Compared with our population—that is, taking into account the increase of population and the decrease of sheep and cattle and the small increase in swine, and comparing their number to each 100 of the population in 1914 with the number to each 100 of the population in 1910—there is a shortage in milch cows of 4.4 per cent; in other meat cattle, 19.2 per cent; in sheep, 11.6 per cent; and in swine, 5.2 per cent.

These statements, if not in themselves alarming, certainly are reasons enough why we must have importations of meat into the United States, and we may look for such importations from Argentina.

I have been unable to find reliable statistics of the number of cattle and sheep in Argentina during the last few years, but from December, 1909, to December, 1910, the number of neat cattle increased less than 4 per cent, but the number of sheep increased about 25 per cent.

I called the attention of the House a year ago to our great increase of exports of manufactured articles and the great decrease in our exports of farm products. Our urban population is increasing much more rapidly than our rural population, and unless we materially increase the yield per acre of our land the time is not far distant when we must look beyond our own boundary lines for food. Irrespective of tariff rates or tariff changes our importations of food products are likely to increase.

From 1900 to 1910 the United States increased in population 21 per cent. In that same period the average of our cereal production increased but 3.5 per cent, and the yield in 1909 was only 1.6 per cent greater than in 1899. In 1899 we produced of cereals 58.4 bushels per head, in 1909 49.1 bushels per head. The demand for importations will bring importations, but, as I have tried to show, it does not follow that on account of the importations of farm products the farmers will receive less for the things they raise.

I have already presented market reports from two small towns in Minnesota showing that practically everything the farmer raises brings a better price this year, after the enactment of the Underwood tariff law, than last year under the Payne-Aldrich tariff. I now present a table showing the Chicago market prices. They are taken from the files of the Daily Trade Bulletin in the office of J. R. Whitney & Co., and were prepared by the Carroll Times, an Iowa paper. The quotations of prices were taken for commodities on the Chicago Board of Trade on the dates specified.

February, 1913, came in on Saturday. The dates for which quotations are given are, therefore, February 1, 8, 15, and 21. There was no session of the board of trade on Saturday, February 22, a public holiday. The Saturdays of 1914 most nearly corresponding to these were January 31, February 7, 14, and 21. These are the dates for which the following quotations were reported in the Daily Trade Bulletin, and we invite doubters to consult the files themselves for verification or refutation of the figures given by us. The corn prices quoted are the cash prices for No. 3 mixed, on track, Chicago, which is selected as a standard grade. Any other grade might be chosen, but the lesson taught by the quotations would be the same. The prices given on wheat are for No. 2 spring. The prices quoted on hogs are the lowest and highest, including both light and heavy grades, but excluding "pigs." The quotations on cattle are for "steers, medium to choice."

CORN—NO. 3 MIXED, ON TRACK, CHICAGO.			
	Low.	High.	
1913.			
Feb. 1.....	48	50	
Feb. 8.....	49½	50½	
Feb. 15.....	47½	49½	
Feb. 21.....	47½	49	
1914.			
Jan. 31.....	60½	63	
Feb. 7.....	60	64	
Feb. 14.....	59½	63	
Feb. 21.....	59½	64	
WHEAT—NO. 2 SPRING.			
	Low.	High.	
1913.			
Feb. 1.....	88	90	
Feb. 8.....	88	90½	
Feb. 15.....	87	89	
Feb. 21.....	87	89½	
1914.			
Jan. 31.....	88½	90	
Feb. 7.....	89½	91½	
Feb. 14.....	91	92	
Feb. 21.....	93	95	
LIVE HOGS—LIGHT AND HEAVY.			
	Low.	High.	
1913.			
Feb. 1.....	7.30	7.70	
Feb. 8.....	7.85	8.10	
Feb. 15.....	8.00	8.35	
Feb. 21.....	8.15	8.40	
1914.			
Jan. 31.....	8.25	8.50	
Feb. 7.....	8.45	8.72½	
Feb. 14.....	8.25	8.60	
Feb. 21.....	8.40	8.75	
CATTLE—STEERS, MEDIUM TO CHOICE.			
	Low.	High.	
1913.			
Feb. 1.....	7.50	8.25	
Feb. 8.....	7.60	8.25	
Feb. 15.....	7.90	8.50	
Feb. 21.....	7.90	8.50	
1914.			
Jan. 31.....	7.85	8.85	
Feb. 7.....	7.85	8.65	
Feb. 14.....	7.75	8.65	
Feb. 21.....	7.85	8.60	

The Chicago prices for eggs in February, 1913, ranged from 15 to 24 cents. The prices for February, 1914, have thus far ranged from 24½ to 27 cents.

Next, I present a table showing the comparative wholesale prices of 12 commodities selected from 106. In connection with this table let me say that Bradstreet's index number of commodity prices has followed a downward course this year for the third time. The fall is only three-tenths of 1 per cent for the interval between February 1 and March 1. The present index number is the lowest reported since October, 1911, and it is lower than the numbers reported on March 1, 1913, 1912, 1910, and 1907.

Now, notwithstanding this general downward tendency of prices, the 12 articles selected, being all of the farm products listed, with the exception of butter, indicate prices this year higher than those of a year ago.

Comparative wholesale prices of 12 commodities.

TWELVE QUOTATIONS RULING FOR STANDARD GRADES AT THE HIGH POINT ON DEC. 1, 1912, MAR. 1, 1913, AND MAR. 1, 1914.

[From Bradstreet's.]

Commodities.	Dec. 1, 1912.	Mar. 1, 1913.	Mar. 1, 1914.
Wheat, No. 2, red winter, in elevator.....	\$1.06	\$1.10	\$1.05
Corn, No. 2, mixed, in elevator.....	.66	.61	.725
Oats, No. 2, mixed, in elevator.....	.37	.38	.455
Barley, No. 2 (Milwaukee).....	.72	.70	.70
Rye, western.....	.68	.70	.685
(All of above per bushel.)			
Beaves, best, native steers (Chicago).....	11.00	9.00	6.65
Sheep, prime (Chicago).....	4.65	6.85	6.25
Hogs, prime (Chicago).....	7.65	8.50	8.55
(All of above per 100 pounds.)			
Milk (New York)..... per quart.....	.050275	.04275	.0475
Eggs, State, fresh (New York)..... per dozen.....	.42	.25	.31
Butter, creamery, State, best..... per pound.....	.37	.36	.315
Potatoes, eastern..... per 180 pounds.....	1.75	1.87	2.75

Last of all I present a table showing the prices paid to farmers for corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, potatoes, flaxseed, hay, and cotton on the 1st day of April 1914, and the 1st day of

April, 1913. The average for the United States shows higher prices this year for all of these products. This table has been prepared by the Department of Agriculture:

Prices to producers of agricultural products Apr. 1, 1914 and 1913.
[Cotton in cents per pound; hay, dollars per ton; other products, cents per bushel.]

State.	Corn.		Wheat.		Oats.		Barley.		Rye.		Buckwheat.		Potatoes.		Flaxseed.		Hay.		Cotton.	
	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913
	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Dolls.	Dolls.	Cts.	Cts.
Maine	84	68	100	116	58	49	80	72	115	75	65	70	55	40			12.80	13.70		
New Hampshire	76	67	120	104	53	48		95		75	75	81	65				16.80	16.10		
Vermont	75	67	101	100	53	46	87	85	70	88	95	78	63				14.90	14.10		
Massachusetts	79	69			56	46			93	97	86	72	85	70			20.50	19.80		
Rhode Island	93	89							107		80	95	80				21.80	24.00		
Connecticut	79	69			50	41			80	91	90	100	81	77			20.00	20.80		
New York	77	64	97	101	48	43	70	69	72	73	81	67	85	57			14.80	12.90		
New Jersey	77	64	97	100	47	42			75	70	75	82	83	67			18.70	17.80		
Pennsylvania	74	61	95	101	48	42	65	68	78	74	73	66	81	61			14.50	13.50		
Delaware	70	55	97	99	40	40			75	76			105	81			16.00	14.50		
Maryland	74	58	95	100	50	45	65	65	74	78	80	82	85	59			15.50	12.00		
Virginia	85	73	101	106	55	54	72	75	84	82	86	82	85	75			15.80	15.60		12.2
West Virginia	85	71	101	104	56	51			87	84	83	73	105	73			16.30	13.20		
North Carolina	94	83	112	118	62	62			98	103	85	90	90	91			18.50	16.30	12.6	12.0
South Carolina	98	89	116	124	67	64			175	150			123	128			18.30	19.00	12.6	12.0
Georgia	94	80	122	122	65	64	134		115	150			115	125			18.20	17.60	12.8	11.9
Florida	86	62			64	68							150	126			17.30	17.30	15.6	12.4
Ohio	61	51	93	99	39	33	57	50	68	72		68	80	56			12.20	10.30		
Indiana	61	48	91	97	39	32	50	65	63	67	85		83	53			12.70	10.80		
Illinois	64	47	88	90	38	31	55	54	62	71	100	93	91	58			13.90	12.00		
Michigan	64	51	92	99	40	32	64	63	60	57	68	64	50	36			12.00	10.70		
Wisconsin	59	49	82	82	37	32	52	50	55	56	72	64	53	31	140	130	10.30	10.60		
Minnesota	52	41	83	76	32	26	45	43	51	49	62	62	53	28	136	113	6.40	6.50		
Iowa	59	41	70	79	34	29	52	51	62	60	84	81	93	51	120	110	9.80	9.60	11.6	9.5
Missouri	74	50	86	95	46	37		60	74	78	96	98	99	74	145	112	14.20	9.40		
North Dakota	51	47	81	72	32	23	39	34	48	47			57	31	137	106	5.80	5.20		
South Dakota	57	39	79	73	33	26	44	41	51	57			75	39	132	114	7.00	5.60		
Nebraska	63	44	75	74	37	31	52	40	57	56			94	53			8.50	7.20		
Kansas	73	48	80	78	46	40	57	42	65	67			98	77	133	130	12.10	7.60		
Kentucky	81	64	98	103	54	49	72	82	84	88			103	66			17.20	14.10		
Tennessee	82	67	101	107	56	54	82	75	102	100	73	75	112	75			17.40	15.10	12.0	11.9
Alabama	93	79	119	106	67	58	95		150	150			116	118			16.20	14.20	12.6	11.9
Mississippi	82	75		89	62	61							113	116			13.50	12.70	12.2	11.9
Louisiana	77	79			58	55							108	115			13.40	12.30	11.7	11.9
Texas	88	69	95	93	50	44	63	68	104	110			113	109			13.10	10.60	11.0	11.8
Oklahoma	74	50	81	77	48	39	68	50	93	87			100	91			11.50	7.40	11.2	11.5
Arkansas	82	72	88	94	54	55			65	95			114	102			15.20	14.40	11.3	11.8
Montana	81	59	71	65	33	39	52	48	61	68			60	52	123	129	8.00	9.70		
Wyoming	88	62	86	94	46	46	70	80	64	70			70	80			8.60	6.80		
Colorado	71	53	78	77	46	37	60	44	56	49			59	41			9.80	8.30		
New Mexico	72	81	79	72	40	39	79	48					113	103			14.50	11.30		
Arizona	112	95	109	101	67	80	79	77					150	95			12.00	15.00		
Utah	73	70	73	72	41	42	50	53	55	67			62	44			10.00	9.00		
Nevada				90	50	52	77	88					64	45			10.00	11.00		
Idaho	76	80	68	73	34	35	48	49	90	69			55	24			8.00	7.50		
Washington	71	89	80	80	41	41	50	50	60	57			42	26			11.60	10.50		
Oregon	70	78	86	79	40	41	62	58	85	73			43	36			9.00	8.30		
California	83	77	97	95	52	51	66	64	110	86			73	45			11.00	14.00		12.5
United States	70.7	53.7	84.2	79.1	39.5	33.1	51.7	48.5	63.0	62.9	76.9	68.3	70.0	50.3	132.8	113.6	12.20	11.15	11.9	11.8

From the tables which have been presented the conclusion reached is a conclusion of fact. Notwithstanding the reductions in the new tariff law and the importations which have followed its enactment, the farmers of the United States are receiving better prices for their products than they received a year ago. From the statistics which have been presented a conclusion may be reached based upon facts, and that is that there is no occasion for the farmers to fear that importations from other countries will affect the prices they can secure for their products.

The Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was denounced in the platform of the Democratic Party and in the platform of the Progressive Party; it received but faint praise in the platform of the Republican Party; it was repudiated by the people of the United States. The Democratic Party was delegated to write a new tariff law; it has accomplished its task. It promised to reduce the tariff duties; it has done so. Last October the question was squarely put to the Members of this body, "Will you vote for a tariff law reducing tariff duties, or will you stand for the Payne-Aldrich tariff schedules?" There was no other proposition; it was a choice between the Underwood tariff law and the Payne-Aldrich law. Those who voted for the Underwood bill voted against the Payne bill, and those who voted against the Underwood bill voted for the Payne bill. The supporters of the Payne-Aldrich bill have heretofore attempted to make the farmers of the country believe that the Underwood bill discriminated against their products; they will probably continue their efforts. Some farmers may believe them, but those who read and those who think will not believe them. Here are the demonstrations proving that since the new tariff law was enacted the prices of the things they sell have increased and the prices of much that they buy have decreased, and they can look forward to the certainty of good markets without fear of low prices. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes; if the gentleman will be quick.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the gentleman mean to tell us that the result of the tariff bill is to increase the cost of the necessities of life?

Mr. HAMMOND. I explained that fully.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was not in the Chamber at the time. I simply wanted to know if that is the gentleman's opinion, that the result of the tariff bill has been to increase the cost of the necessities of life?

Mr. HAMMOND. I made the statement that I was not trying to deal in buncombe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota use some of his time?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] one hour, or so much thereof as he desires to consume.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have it understood that the part of the hour which I do not use is reserved by me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the time belongs to the gentleman from Illinois in his own right.

Mr. DAVIS. That is the understanding.

Mr. BARTLETT. He has the hour to dispose of as he sees fit.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that the subject of the recall of judicial decisions and the growth of the power of the judicial branch of our Government is a dry subject, and that very probably I shall not be able to present it to you in an entertaining manner. But the platform of the Pro-

gressive Party, upon which I was elected to this body, provided among other things as follows:

THE COURTS.

The Progressive Party demands such restriction of the power of the courts as shall leave to the people the ultimate authority to determine fundamental questions of social welfare and public policy. To secure this end, it pledges itself to provide:

1. That when an act, passed under the police power of the State, is held unconstitutional under the State constitution, by the courts, the people, after an ample interval for deliberation, shall have an opportunity to vote on the question whether they desire the act to become a law, notwithstanding such decision.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in addressing the House on this subject at this time is only to show that the basic principle of the doctrine of recall of decisions is very old, and that the protest against the ever-increasing power of the judicial branch of the Government originated with the Marbury decision, and has continued unabated ever since.

There are now eight States in which the recall has been adopted by constitutional amendment—Oregon, California, Arizona, Arkansas, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, and Colorado.

Two methods are used. The Oregon plan, which means that an official sought to be recalled appears on the ballot as a candidate for reelection. A plurality vote elects. The California plan under which the question of recall is voted on separately. If a majority of those voting vote for recall, the plurality candidate succeeds to the office. The voter, however, must vote on recall before voting for the candidate.

The doctrine of recall as applied to administrative offices is rapidly becoming popular in every State, and is not violently opposed by any political party.

The recall as sought to be applied to judges and judicial decisions is strenuously opposed by the two old parties as being revolutionary and subversive of good government. They say it is an attack on the check and balance theory of our forefathers, when they established the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government with the view of constitutional independence for each department.

Alexander Hamilton, the brilliant leader of the Federalist Party, saw that his ideas of concentrating the powers of Government could not be carried out successfully under the Constitution by means of the executive and legislative departments, because they were too responsive to the people and too easily reached by them. Hamilton did not believe in the rule of the people. He did not believe they were capable of self-government.

The defeat of Adams and the triumphant election of Jefferson, who stood for the rule of the people and the sovereignty of the State, made plain to Hamilton that the Constitution was a "frail and worthless fabric," and he immediately turned to the judicial branch of the Government as to an ark of safety, which the Constitution had placed beyond the reach of public opinion and the people.

John Marshall, who had been Secretary of State for Adams, was selected for Justice of the Supreme Court as the strongest and best equipped Federalist to carry forward Hamilton's idea of a powerful judiciary. It should be remembered that the Federalists had just been expelled, root and branch, from all those departments of the Government which under the Constitution could be reached by the people, and that Hamilton, Adams, Marshall, and their followers actually believed that the rights of persons and property and all the interests which they regarded as sacred were put in jeopardy by the election of Jefferson. Jefferson believed in the people. They feared the power of the people at the ballot box.

It is only natural to suppose that under such impressions the leaders of the Federalist Party would make haste to strengthen that branch of the Government to which they now turned to preserve their theories. Immediately after it became certain that the people had turned them out of power they availed themselves of their authority under the Constitution to establish new courts in all the States of the Confederacy and in the District of Columbia. Adams appointed three judges for each court for life or during good behavior—21 judges in all outside of the District of Columbia—every one of whom was placed beyond the power of the new Government under Jefferson that had been selected by the people to succeed the Federalists. Among the midnight appointments which Adams made were 42 magistrates for the District of Columbia, all of whom were to hold their offices for a period beyond that for which the President himself had been elected.

Adams sent the nominations to the Senate on the 2d of March. They were confirmed during the night of the 3d and Jefferson found them on the table in the Department of State the next morning. The commissions had not been delivered. Jefferson held that delivery was necessary to make them effective,

and at once directed Madison, his Secretary of State, to destroy them.

Jefferson's course in refusing to sanction the appointments made by Adams furnished the desired opportunity to the Federalists to institute proceedings for mandamus to compel Madison to deliver the commissions. Out of this controversy grew the celebrated case of *Marbury v. Madison* (1 Cranch, U. S. Reports, 137).

The judges of the Supreme Court were all Federalists and the Chief Justice was none other than President Jefferson's old-time political enemy, John Marshall, the ablest judge that ever occupied a seat upon the bench of the Supreme Court. No man perhaps was ever more strictly just or legally honest; but he entertained during his whole public life as a Member of Congress, Secretary of War, Secretary of State, and supreme judge Federal principles and prejudices of the most intense character, and consequently no man in the Nation better equipped to carry out Hamilton's ideas of government could have been found.

Jefferson was advised that steps would be taken by the friends of Adams to compel him to deliver the commissions to the judges who had been appointed, and he at once took measures to defend and maintain the dignity of the Executive Department of the Government. Madison, as Secretary of State, was advised not to make himself a party to any act which could be construed as a recognition of the authority of the judicial branch of the Government to meddle in the affair.

Hamilton directed a motion to be entered at the December term of the Supreme Court, asking for a rule on Madison to show cause why a writ of mandamus should not issue commanding him to deliver the commissions to the judges, whom Adams had nominated.

Notice of the motion was served on Madison, but he paid no attention to the matter and refused to appear in court. He also declined to answer any questions relative to the commissions, and did not in any manner recognize the right or power of the court to hear the questions involved, much less to pass judgment upon them.

The Supreme Court, however, with John Marshall as Chief Justice, proceeded to hold an "ex parte" hearing.

Three questions were presented for the consideration of the court: First, could the Supreme Court award the writ of mandamus in any case; Second, would the writ lie to a Secretary of State in any case whatever; Third, could the Supreme Court in the present case award a writ of mandamus to James Madison, Secretary of State?

Of course, every lawyer will now admit the very first question to have been determined was the question of jurisdiction. Did the Supreme Court have jurisdiction to hear and determine the case?

If the court determines that it is without jurisdiction to hear the case, then it should not attempt a hearing on the merits, and much less should the court attempt to render a decision on the merits.

Under the Constitution it was evident that the Supreme Court was without jurisdiction to try the case, and such was finally the unanimous opinion of the court; but Marshall reversed the order of consideration of the points involved in the case and actually wrote an opinion on the merits, in which he attempted to show that withholding the commissions was an act unwarranted by law and was a violation of a vested legal right, and then concluded by holding that the Supreme Court had no jurisdiction of the subject and no right to grant the writ of mandamus. The course pursued by Marshall in that case and sanctioned by all the associate judges was most exceptional and absolutely without precedent in English or American law. Under the Constitution it was certain that the court had no original jurisdiction of the subject matter and could not under any state of facts grant the writ of mandamus. Why, then, render a decision on the merits?

A decision on the merits, followed by a denial of the writ for want of jurisdiction, could have had no other purpose than to indicate to the courts of inferior jurisdiction what the Supreme Court would do if such a case was brought before it on appeal. The hearing had been "ex parte," and that was an additional reason for a determination of the question of jurisdiction without touching the merits. The truth is borne out by subsequent history—that the case of *Marbury* against Madison was a political legal battle between the Federalist and the anti-Federalist idea of government, with Marshall and Jefferson acting as the chief exponents of the contending political thought of the age.

It was the first inroad of the judicial branch of the Government on the power of the executive department, and it laid the foundation for a judicial superstructure that has become an

actual menace to the legislative and executive departments of the Government in State and Nation.

Hamilton, Marshall, and Adams foresaw the great power of the judicial department of the Government under such an interpretation of the Constitution as was laid down in the Marbury case, and knew it could not be checked by the people, for under the Constitution the people could not reach the judges.

The doctrine of the recall of judicial decisions and the limitation of the power of the judiciary found advocates then and there.

In the great fight of President Jackson against the Bank of the United States we see again a feeble effort to limit the controlling influence of the judiciary over the other departments of the Government in regard to questions of constitutional power. Andrew Jackson argued that the division of the powers of the Federal Government into distinct and independent departments was founded on well-established principles of tremendous importance to the welfare of the Nation, and his bank veto message contained the following language:

If the opinion of the Supreme Court covered the whole ground of this act, it ought not to control the coordinate authorities of the Government. The Congress, the Executive, and the Court must each for itself be guided by its own opinion of the Constitution. Each public officer who takes an oath to support the Constitution swears that he will support it as he understands it and not as it is understood by others.

It is as much the duty of the House of Representatives, of the Senate, and of the President to decide upon the constitutionality of any bill or resolution which may be presented to them for passage or approval as it is of the supreme judges when it may be brought before them for judicial decision.

The opinion of the judges has no more authority over Congress than the opinion of Congress has over the judges, and on that point the President is independent of both. The authority of the Supreme Court must not, therefore, be permitted to control the Congress or the Executive when acting in their legislative capacities, but to have only such influence as the force of their reasoning may deserve.

While we can not agree with all the reasoning of President Jackson in this declaration, it is nevertheless a notable fact that Webster assented to most of it, although bitterly opposing Jackson on his bank policy. Webster said:

It is true that each branch of the legislature has an undoubted right in the exercise of its functions to consider the constitutionality of a law proposed to be passed. This is naturally a part of its duty, and neither branch can be compelled to pass any law or do any other act which it deems to be beyond the reach of its constitutional power. The President has the same right when a bill is presented for his approval, for he is doubtless bound to consider in all cases whether such bill be compatible with the Constitution and whether he can approve it consistently with his oath of office.

Webster, however, concluded, with great force and power, that the Constitution had constituted the Supreme Court a tribunal to decide great constitutional questions, and that when the Court had decided such a question it was forever put at rest, and that every department of the Government must acquiesce. This was Hamilton's idea, and it was the principle sought to be established by Marshall in the Marbury case. The continued growth and development of this power of the judiciary has resulted in judicial legislation and a consequent demand by the people for a limitation of the powers of the judicial branch of the Government.

Senator White, in answering Webster, contended that the Constitution vests the judicial power in a Supreme Court and such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish, and that whenever a suit is commenced and prosecuted in the courts of the United States, of which they have jurisdiction, and such suit is decided by the Supreme Court—as that is the court of last resort—its decision is final and conclusive between the parties. But as an authority it does not bind either the Congress or the President of the United States. He argued that if either of these coordinate departments is afterwards called upon to perform an official act, and believes the performance of that act will be a violation of the Constitution, they are not bound to perform it, but, on the contrary, are as much at liberty to decline acting as if no such decision had been made. He declared that—

If different interpretations are put upon the Constitution by the different departments of the Government, the people is the tribunal to settle the dispute. Each of the departments—executive, legislative, and judicial—is the agent of the people, doing their business according to the powers conferred; and where there is a disagreement as to the extent of these powers, the people themselves through the ballot boxes must settle it.

This is the true view of the Constitution. Beyond question it is the construction which those who framed and adopted it placed upon it. It was the origin of the doctrine of the recall of judicial decision by the people.

The more carefully the questions involved are examined the more apparent becomes the dangers to the well-being and the liberties of our people of the principle under which it is claimed that the judicial branch of our Government has a controlling power over the other departments of the Government relative to constitutional questions.

I contend that nowhere in the Constitution of the United States is the Supreme Court expressly authorized to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional. When it was proposed in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 to give the Supreme Court of the Nation a limited veto upon Congress, the convention refused four different times to permit it.

The Supreme Court for years claimed no such power and made no attempt to exercise it. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Supreme Court is the greatest court in the world. It enjoys jurisdiction and power not claimed by the supreme tribunal of any other nation on the globe. Such a court would not be tolerated in England, France, or Germany. When the legislative bodies of those nations enact a law no court can unmake that law. Measured by its tremendous power, our Supreme Court is unrivaled.

John Marshall, by his interpretation of our Constitution, made the Supreme Court of the United States the most powerful branch of our Government.

He was the Chief Justice of a court that Jefferson said was "advancing its noiseless steps like a thief over the field of jurisdiction," and yet Marshall as a lawyer in earlier years when arguing a case before the Supreme Court, in which the Virginia sequestration act was attacked as unconstitutional, used this remarkable language:

The legislative authority of any country can only be restrained by its own municipal constitution. This is a principle that springs from the very nature of society, and the judicial authority can have no right to question the validity of a law unless such jurisdiction is expressly given by the Constitution.

The recall of judicial decisions is condemned by its enemies without rhyme or reason. Some men say it would lead to anarchy; that it is a new-fangled idea of Theodore Roosevelt, and, like all other theories of government advanced by Roosevelt and the Progressive Party, is inimical to the liberties of the people regulated by law. Harvey, who discovered the circulation of the blood in the human body, was almost burned at the stake by the enemies of human progress.

The direct primary, the initiative, the referendum, the recall, equal suffrage, and the short ballot have been and still are bitterly fought by the enemies of progress in government, by the men who fear the people, and yet those theories of government are as certain to become the practical means by which our people are to be governed as it is certain that our blood does circulate through our bodies.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, ridicule and unfair criticism will not answer the demand for the recall of judges or of judicial decisions.

Years after the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian contests for power between departments of the Government had ended, the doctrine of complete immunity from criticism of our courts took root and flourished until undeniable evils crept into the system and such outrageous wrongs were perpetrated by our courts in the name of justice that the people reluctantly came to believe the charge that their highest courts were influenced by great corporations and special interests. So many concrete examples and specific instances of laws being declared unconstitutional by our courts came to public notice that many men believed the supreme judges of our State and Federal courts were usurping powers that threatened the well-being of the people.

This usurpation has taken two forms: First, an attempt not merely to interpret the law, but to legislate; and, second, the exercise of the veto power on the lawmaking body—the too frequent exercise of the power to declare laws enacted by Congress and State legislatures unconstitutional and void. The solemn truth is we have too many courts and too much judge-made law. [Applause.]

It requires as much heart and brain for a judge to decide the fate of a poor devil charged with the theft of a loaf of bread as it does to determine what shall be done with the millionaire thief, whose manipulations of watered stocks have brought anguish and ruin to many homes.

The right of appeal is much too broad, and our legal procedure in nearly all our States is nothing less than an abomination.

The right to demur, to file special pleas and additional counts, the rebutter and the surrebutter have filled our reports with worthless technicalities and has cost litigants millions of dollars, for which they have received nothing, unless it was the knowledge that their lawyers were being educated in the intricacies and sophistries of technical pleading. Under our present judicial system a man of wealth and a cunning lawyer can delay the plainest and most simple lawsuit until the pocket and the patience of a poor man are exhausted.

A judge of the supreme court of one of our States, in a recent address, said:

Our laws are inadequate. They do not satisfy the popular conception of equal justice. The people clamor against the law, its delays, its discriminations, its inconsistencies; and with much reason. Something will happen. Unless judges will act, the people will act. If they do not resort to the recall, they will revise the Constitution; they will create new courts—courts to do rough justice, courts to do summary justice, courts close to the common people, courts without technicalities, sophistries, and delays, where substantial right prevails.

Mr. Taft said:

Of all the questions that are before the American people I regard no one as more important than this: The improvement of the administration of justice. We must make it so that the poor man will have, as nearly as possible, an equal opportunity in litigating as the rich man; and under present conditions, ashamed as we may be of it, this is not the fact.

Judge Clark, of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, has said that—

At the present time the supreme power is not in the hands of the people, but in the power of the judges, who can set aside at will any expression of the people's will made through an act of Congress or a State legislature. These judges are not chosen by the people nor subject to review by them. This is arbitrary power and the corporations have taken possession of it simply by naming a majority of the judges.

Mr. Speaker, this is strong language. Is it surprising that men in the shop and in the field should distrust our courts under these circumstances? And is it remarkable that the people should demand a change in the system? Let us examine the record more carefully and ascertain, if possible, whether or not there is any just cause for the recall of judicial decisions.

In 1884 the legislature of the State of New York passed an act entitled "An act to improve the public health by prohibiting the manufacture of cigars and the preparation of tobaccos in any form in tenement houses in certain cases." The New York court of appeals held the law unconstitutional. This decision, in effect, said to the people of New York, "You can not pass laws to safeguard the health and the lives of the citizens of your State where a question of property right is involved."

Gov. Aldrich, of Nebraska, in speaking of the decision in the well-known Minnesota rate case, said:

When any court, whether it be the United States Supreme Court or a court of inferior jurisdiction, continually makes effort by judicial decision to do that which the people and the people alone have a right to do, then I say that such a court is seeking to establish judicial tyranny. And if allowed to proceed unchallenged along the line of this unwarranted assumption of power, representative government will simply be that in name only.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes.

Mr. DIES. I should like to ask the gentleman who made the constitution of the State of New York, that he seems to think the courts ought not to protect the people in the enforcement of?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Who made the constitution?

Mr. DIES. Who made the constitution of the State of New York, that the court was upholding for the people?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. It should have been made by the representatives of the people.

Mr. DIES. Well, who made it?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I do not know. I was not there. Perhaps the gentleman can tell me who made it.

Mr. DIES. The people make all constitutions. Every constitution of a free State of this Union is made by the sovereign people of that State.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I presume the people made it. They should have made it through their representatives.

Mr. DIES. Then the courts of New York merely sustained the people in upholding their organic law.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I do not consider that the gentleman has asked me a question that I am to answer any further than I have answered it.

About 10 years ago the legislature of New York passed a law limiting the hours of labor in bakeries in that State in the interest of the health and lives of its citizens engaged in that work. The law had been given intelligent consideration by the members of the State legislature. It had been approved by the governor and sustained by the highest court of the State of New York, and yet in the case of *Lochner v. New York*, One hundred and ninety-eighth United States Reports, page 45, a divided court, five out of nine judges, declared that the law was unconstitutional.

Mr. Justice Harlan in a dissenting opinion said:

If there be doubt as to the validity of the statute, that doubt must therefore be resolved in favor of its validity, and the courts must keep their hands off, leaving the legislature to meet the responsibility for unwise legislation.

But the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Holmes strikes the very heart of the matter when he says:

This case is decided upon an economic theory which a large part of the country does not entertain. If it were a question whether I agree

with that theory (limiting the consecutive hours of labor in bakeries which may be required of an employee), I should desire to study it further and long before making up my mind. But I do not conceive that to be my duty, because I strongly believe that my agreement or disagreement has nothing to do with the right of a majority to embody their opinions in law.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield for a question.

Mr. DIES. I understand the gentleman wants the Constitution of the United States enforced and interpreted; and since the Supreme Court is not to interpret it, according to the gentleman's statement, who is to interpret the written Constitution of the United States?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. If the gentleman will wait a few moments, I think I will answer that in my speech.

Mr. DIES. I am waiting patiently.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Is there not just a gentle hint here that, perhaps the majority of the court did not believe in the economic theory contained in the statute, and for that reason declared the act unconstitutional? In 1906 Congress passed an act, which was approved by the President, known as the employees' liability act. This law made common carriers engaged in interstate commerce liable for all damages resulting from the negligence of its officers, agents, or employees, or by reason of any defects, results from negligence in the cars, machinery, roadbed, and so forth. The Supreme Court, by a vote of 5 to 4, held this statute unconstitutional.

In August, 1894, Congress passed an income-tax law, which, in substance, provided for a tax of 2 per cent on net incomes above \$4,000.

A man named Charles Pollock, a stockholder in the Farmers' Loan & Trust Co. of New York, brought an action to restrain or enjoin the collection of the tax, claiming that the law was unconstitutional.

When the first argument was made in the Supreme Court in March, 1895, Mr. Justice Jackson, on account of illness, took no part in the case. The lower court had held the act constitutional. The eight members of the court were equally divided on all questions involved in the constitutionality of the act with the single exception of the provision which imposed a tax upon rents and incomes from real estate. When the case was reargued Justice Jackson was present and voted to sustain the law, but for some reason one of the judges who at first had been in favor of sustaining the law changed his vote and the law was annihilated.

Justice Field, in his opinion declaring this law unconstitutional, said:

The present assault upon capital is but the beginning. It will be but the stepping-stone to others larger and more sweeping till our political contests will become a war of the poor against the rich.

Judge Clark, of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, in speaking of this decision, said:

One man nullified the action of Congress and the President and 75,000,000 living people. In 13 years that decision has taxed the property and labor of the country \$1,003,000,000, which Congress in compliance with the public will, and relying upon previous decisions of the court, had decreed should be paid out of the excessive incomes of the rich.

Justice Jackson, in a dissenting opinion, said:

The decision (of the majority of the court) disregards the well-established canon of construction that an act passed by a coordinate branch of the Government has every presumption in its favor, and should never be declared invalid by the court unless its repugnancy to the Constitution is clear beyond all reasonable doubt.

And Justice Brown said:

While I have no doubt that Congress will find some means of surmounting the present crisis, my fear is that in some moment of national peril this decision will rise up to frustrate its will and paralyze its arm.

No matter which side of this controversy we may take, it is evident to any sensible man, from opinions of the judges which I have quoted, that the real question which controlled the court was the expediency or propriety of the income-tax law, and not whether it was in conflict with the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, it is because of the growing belief that our courts declare laws unconstitutional, because they do not believe in the principle or economic ideas embodied in them rather than because they are in conflict with the Constitution, that the doctrine of recall of judges and judicial decisions has found a permanent place in the minds of our people.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I wish to refer briefly to two more decisions, *The Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward* (4 Wheat., 517) and the case of *Fletcher v. Peck* (6 Cr., 87).

The Dartmouth College case was a great victory for the Federalists, but it was much more than that, for it established the doctrine that every charter, franchise, and privilege which any corporation could secure from a legislature was a contract and could not be impaired in any way by subsequent legislation.

Chancellor Kent, speaking with approval of the Dartmouth case, for he was an intense Federalist, said:

The decision in that case did more than any other single act proceeding from the authority of the United States, to throw an impregnable barrier around all rights and franchises derived from the grant of government.

And 50 years later Judge Cole, of the Iowa Supreme Court, said:

The practical effect of the Dartmouth College decision is to exalt the rights of the few above those of the many; and it is doubtless true that under the authority of that decision more monopolies have been created and perpetuated and more wrongs and outrages upon the people affected than by any other single instrumentality in the Government. (See *Dubuque v. Rachard*, A., 33 Iowa, 95.)

Mr. BARTLETT. May I say to the gentleman that it is a fact that the Dartmouth College case led every State in the Union, I believe, either to put in its constitution a prohibition against the granting of charters that were irrevocable, or to the putting into the act granting a charter to a corporation of the reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. So that the decision in the Dartmouth College case is no longer law, either in the States or in the Nation.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. That is true. Under the rule laid down in the Fletcher case a charter or franchise procured by fraud can not be invalidated, no matter how brazen the fraud. Mr. Chairman, in view of all these things can we pretend surprise that the people should follow Theodore Roosevelt when he says:

I urge that in such cases, where the courts construe the Constitution as if property rights had a first mortgage on the Constitution, to the exclusion of human rights, the people, after careful deliberation, be given the right to vote and finally determine whether the law which was set aside shall be valid or not.

Mr. DIES. I should be glad to have a distinction drawn between human rights and property rights, if the gentleman will so favor us.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. If the gentleman can not draw a distinction between a human life and a mile of Pennsylvania Railroad track, why, I must confess that I fear I could not enlighten him.

Mr. DIES. I did not say human life. I said the distinction between human rights and property rights.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. It is common knowledge that the people have nothing to do with the appointment of a Federal judge or his retention in office; and it is just as generally understood that most Federal judges are nominated and appointed through the influence of special interests. Why should not the people, whose servants the judges are supposed to be, have power to recall them, and also their decisions, when those decisions are in conflict with a public need and a righteous public demand? Do you say the people will make mistakes in attempting to secure control of their judicial servants by means of the recall? I answer that throughout all history that same argument has been made against every attempt of the people to acquire some share in their government. Let the agents of special interests argue and protest as they may, the stubborn fact remains that the people intend to take such steps as may be necessary to compel the courts to serve the interests of the whole people, as was the original intent of the Constitution.

We have recently decided that United States Senators shall be elected by the people. The judges of our State supreme courts are elected by the people. Why should powerful special interests have the right to influence the appointment of Federal judges and the people, whose servants they are, be powerless to reach them or their decisions? [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 18 minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield for an interruption?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I will yield for a question, although I would like to save the time for somebody else. I reserve my time unless the question the gentleman wants to ask is an important one.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask a rather important question. We understand, of course, that all citizens stand on an equality before the law and the courts, the poor man as well as the great corporation. Now, the point I would like to have my colleague make plain to me, if possible, is this: In the case of the recall of judicial decisions does he believe that the poor and unfortunate of whom he has spoken in his excellent address would have an equal opportunity before the people in a contest with the powerful interests in the country that could use every

means of advertising and carrying on a campaign in the interest of the recall of a decision that might be against them?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I will answer that by saying that while the poor are always handicapped in a battle against the rich, still they would avail themselves of the opportunity to register their will, whereas under the present system they can not be heard at all.

Mr. McKENZIE. The point I am trying to have the gentleman make clear is—

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I do not concede, however, if the gentleman will pardon me, that before the law as it now exists, and under the present method of procedure in the most of the States, the poor man is on an equality with the rich man in our courts by any means.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman has stated a few instances of where the court may be in error, but is it not true that in the thousands and thousands of cases that have been decided by the courts in the country but little criticism has been made?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Undoubtedly that is so.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes; but I would like to reserve the balance of my time for my colleagues.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will take but a moment. Does not the gentleman think that the recall of judicial decisions would lead to the utter confusion of legal principles? For instance, under a certain state of facts there might be involved a certain legal principle, which, when submitted to the people, might receive favorable action. Under an entirely different state of facts, with the same legal principle involved, a totally different result might be reached when submitted to the popular vote. The same legal principle might thus be pronounced constitutional at one election and unconstitutional at another. Does not the gentleman think it would lead to great confusion of legal principles?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. No; I do not think it would any more than a question of public policy would if submitted to the people. I would like to add that it would not lead to any more confusion or hardship than the fact that more than one-half of the decisions rendered by the supreme courts on questions between litigants are decided, not upon the merits of the case in which the litigant is interested, but upon technical points of pleading for which the litigants pay and never know that the interests really involved in the case have been touched. In the State of Illinois one of the most eminent lawyers in the State has made the statement that out of 250 volumes of reports of decisions of the supreme court in that State the decisions on the actual merits of the cases could be put in one-third of the volumes; that the other two-thirds are decisions of the court on technical questions of pleading.

Mr. FITZHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes.

Mr. FITZHENRY. I would like to clear up a point raised by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] referring to the Dartmouth College case not being the law in the United States on account of the State constitutions. In order that the gentleman's excellent speech may not be misinterpreted, I want to call attention to the fact that the Illinois constitution contains the provision prohibiting the making of an irrevocable grant or special privilege or immunity, and the Supreme Court of Illinois has held that that provision in the Bill of Rights or our Constitution applies to the legislature of a State, but that it does not apply to any of the agencies of the legislature. In other words, the legislature can not pass an act that will make an irrevocable grant or special privilege or immunity, but the Supreme Court of Illinois has held that a city council can do it.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I am glad to have that go into the Record. I ought to state that it was not my idea in making this presentation of the Dartmouth College case to have anyone draw the conclusion from that that it was now the law in the different States, or that the different States had not taken action to the contrary, but as tending to show the development of that idea in our judicial system. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I will be recognized in my own time. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITZHENRY] a question. Does not the city in Illinois get its charter from the legislature?

Mr. FITZHENRY. They do.

Mr. BARTLETT. Could not the legislature prohibit the city from granting an irrevocable charter or special privilege or immunity?

Mr. FITZHENRY. It does not, and the supreme court has held that the legislature can not make an irrevocable grant or special privilege or immunity.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 12 minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I reserve the balance of that time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HAMMOND having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution 39.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That for the representation of the Congress at the exercises to be held at the navy yard in Brooklyn, N. Y., on Monday, May 11, 1914, in honor of the men of the Navy and Marine Corps who lost their lives at Vera Cruz, Mexico, there shall be appointed by the Vice President 7 Members of the United States Senate and by the Speaker 15 Members of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. That the expenses of the committee shall be defrayed in equal parts from the contingent appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

PENSIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the proverbial ingratitude of Republics surely can not be charged against ours by the soldiers of the country and their dependents when it is remembered that we have paid them in pensions since the Government was established the vast sum of \$4,500,000,000, aside from giving them nearly 69,000,000 acres of the public domain. Indeed, considering our population and resources and the size of our armies, it may be truthfully said that ours is the most liberal pension system of the world, notwithstanding the fact that it contains some inequalities and injustices, which I shall presently discuss. The legislative history of the evolution of that system, including the parts played in it by individuals and by parties, affords a most interesting illustration of political psychology and party expediency. I possess the somewhat unique status of one who has both an administrative and a legislative knowledge of the pension question, having had nearly a decade of training in the administration of the law and almost as long a period of service—part of the time as a member of the Invalid Pensions Committee—in a legislative body which deals almost constantly with the subject. I think, therefore, that I may be pardoned for assuming to speak with some authority.

Perhaps it would not be amiss for me to give at the outset a brief résumé of pension legislation. The Continental Congress, on the very threshold of our independence, realized what I regret to say some gentlemen do not seem to realize now—the unbounded debt we owe to the men who leave their homes and their families and endanger their health and lives in the hour of the country's peril.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, there was so much confusion I did not understand what the gentleman from Kentucky stated about his experience in pension matters. Did I understand him to say that he had had a good many years of experience in the executive branch of the pension work?

Mr. LANGLEY. I said that I had served in connection with the administration of the pension law for nearly 10 years.

Mr. DAVIS. What branch?

Mr. LANGLEY. I was an examiner in the Pension Bureau for over four years and a member of the Board of Pension Appeals for over five years.

CONTINENTAL CONGRESS.

One of the very first acts passed by that Congress, less than two months after the Declaration of Independence, was that of August 26, 1776, which promised half pay for life, or during disability, to every officer, soldier, sailor, marine, or seaman losing a limb in any engagement or becoming so disabled in the service as to render him incapable of earning a livelihood. Indeed, pensions were granted in this country long before the Declaration of Independence. While the first national pension law was the one to which I have just referred, many of the English colonies in America, early in the history of colonial legislation, provided for the relief of wounded and maimed soldiers.

PILGRIMS AT PLYMOUTH—FIRST PENSION LAW.

In 1636 the Pilgrims at Plymouth enacted in their courts that any man who should be sent forth as a soldier and returned maimed should be maintained competently by the colony during his life. According to history, this is the first pension law ever passed in America. Forty years later, in 1676, a standing committee of the General Court of Massachusetts Bay held regular meetings in "Boston town house" to hear the applications of wounded soldiers for relief; and after this colony was united

with Plymouth colony, under the charter of 1691, the province continued to make provision for the relief of disabled soldiers out of the public treasury. In 1644 the Virginia Assembly passed a disability pension law, and later it made provision for the relief of the indigent families of soldiers who were slain. Similar acts are found in the colonial statutes of Maryland and New York in the latter part of the seventeenth century. The colony of Rhode Island, in 1718, enacted a pension law which provided that every officer, soldier, or sailor employed in its service who should be disabled, by loss of limb or otherwise, for getting a livelihood for himself and family, or other dependent relatives, should have his wounds carefully looked after and healed at the colony's charge, and should have an annual pension for the maintenance of himself and family or other dependent relatives. This law further provided that if any person who had the charge of maintaining a wife, children, parents, or other relatives should be slain in the colony's military service, these relatives should be maintained while unable to provide for themselves.

Thus it will be seen that the custom of pensioning soldiers and sailors is not only as old as the English settlement on this continent, but that in some respects it went even further in the direction of liberality than the pension law of to-day.

BOUNTY LAND.

The same is true with regard to bounty-land legislation. From the earliest era of our history the policy of rewarding the defenders of the country by land bounties was marked with great liberality. Land bounties were even promised before the Nation possessed any public domain. Many instances are recorded of grants by the colonies before our independence. Enormous grants were made by the colonies of North Carolina and Virginia to that intrepid Yankee, Gen. Nathanael Greene, who became such an idol of the southern people. Gen. Lafayette was granted for his services and sacrifices the sum of \$200,000 and one township of public lands, or about 23,000 acres, to be located by the President, which, however, as is well known, Gen. Lafayette declined to accept. A liberal annuity, payable semiannually, was also granted to the widow and each child, by name, of Commodore Perry.

The Continental Congress by resolution of September 16, 1776, provided a regularly graduated scale of land grants for service in the Revolutionary War, ranging from 800 acres for a colonel to 100 acres for a private. Later a major general was given 1,100 acres and a brigadier general 850 acres. Similar laws were passed for service in the War of 1812, Mexican War, and the various Indian wars, but no land grants have been made for service subsequent to 1855, legislation since that time giving preference to the country's defenders in connection with the public domain having been confined to the matter of shortening to the extent of the length of service the period of residence required to acquire a homestead, a minimum residence of one year being required in all cases, however. All these rights in connection with the public domain, it may be added, were also extended to the widow and other relatives practically in the same manner as title to pension is provided in the pension laws.

FIRST NATIONAL LAW PENSIONING WIDOWS AND ORPHANS.

The first national pension law in behalf of widows and orphans was the resolution of August 24, 1780, which extended to widows and orphan children the half-pay provision provided in the act of August 26, 1776, for officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines in cases where death was due to the service, although Margaret Corbin, a widow of a Revolutionary soldier, had been previously pensioned by the resolution of Congress passed July 6, 1779. This case is such an unusual and interesting one that I shall take the time of the committee to read the resolution by which that pension was given to her. It is taken from the Journals of the Continental Congress, and is as follows:

Resolved, That Margaret Corbin, who was wounded and disabled in the attack on Fort Mifflin, whilst she heroically filled the post of her husband who was killed by her side serving a piece of artillery, do receive, during her natural life, or the continuance of the said disability, the one-half of the monthly pay drawn by a soldier in the service of the States; and that she now receive out of the public stores one complete suit of cloaths, or the value thereof in money.

On July 25 of the following year another resolution was passed for her relief, which read as follows:

Resolved, That Margaret Corbin receive annually, during her natural life, one complete suit of cloaths out of the public stores, or the value thereof in money, in addition to the provision made for her by the act of Congress of July 6, 1779.

I mention these instances of the people's patriotic liberality in the early days of the Republic toward its defenders and their

dependents with the hope that they may teach a lesson to those gentlemen of to-day who are constantly inveighing against our present liberal pension system.

Congress from time to time passed laws for the relief of soldiers, sailors, and marines and their widows and orphans following the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the various Indian wars in which the country was engaged prior to the beginning of the Civil War, and our pension system gradually grew more liberal during that period, although it is interesting to note the fact that a longer period of time elapsed after these wars before such relief was granted than was the case following the War of the Revolution.

THE CIVIL WAR.

The pension laws of the country did not, of course, assume very large proportions until the Civil War. This was necessarily true because of the enormous number of participants in that war as compared with previous wars. The act of July 22, 1861, authorizing the employment of volunteers to aid in enforcing the laws and protecting public property promised to those who were disabled in that service the same benefits that had been or might thereafter be conferred on persons disabled in the regular service, and to the widow and legal heirs of those who died or were killed in the service the sum of \$100, "in addition to all arrears of pay and allowances." This was followed by the comprehensive act of July 14, 1862, which is the foundation of our present pension system. This act reenacted the provisions of the act of July 22, 1861, and specified the rates of pension for officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines disabled by reason of wounds received or diseases contracted in the service of the United States and in the line of duty.

These provisions were gradually broadened and liberalized by various subsequent enactments until the beneficiaries became entitled to rates varying from six to one hundred dollars a month, dependent upon the nature and extent of disability. That act also provided pension for the widow and minor children and in the absence of these for the dependent mother, father, orphan sisters and brothers, in the order named, where the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine was the result of his service. This is the first act that conferred a pensionable status upon dependent parents, sisters, and brothers. It may also be noted here that prior to the Civil War there never was any provision of law giving pensions to widows in cases where the death of the husband was due to his service in time of peace. All of the prior enactments for the relief of widows and orphans were confined to cases where death resulted from service during a war. This act of July 14, 1862, fixed the rate of pension for all of these dependent classes at the rate allowed invalids for total disability, which was \$8 a month, except the higher rates provided for officers. The \$2 additional for each minor child of the soldier under 16 years of age was added to the widow's pension by an act passed subsequent to the war, which became effective July 25, 1866. The rate of pension to the widow and to the minor children and dependent relatives in all cases, in which the act of July 14, 1862, limited it to \$8 a month, was increased to \$12 a month by the act of March 19, 1886. Pension for widows and minor children where the death of the husband was not due to his service was first provided in the act of June 27, 1890, which fixed the rate at \$8 a month. This was increased to \$12 by the act of April 19, 1903, the present law. A law has never been enacted granting a pension to dependent relatives other than widows and minor children unless death was due to the service.

FIRST GENERAL ACT FOR SERVICE ONLY.

The act of March 18, 1818, was the first general act passed which granted pension for service only, and it required proof that the beneficiaries were in indigent circumstances and in need of assistance. There were several later service-pension acts for participants in the earlier wars, but it was 25 years after the close of the Civil War before Congress departed from the rule that a pension for the participants in that war must be confined to disability of service origin. This was done by the act of June 27, 1890, which fixed the minimum pension at \$6 and the maximum at \$12 a month, regardless of rank, requiring proof only of inability to perform manual labor and without showing that the disability was of service origin. This was also a service pension in that a minimum service of 90 days was required.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Has the gentleman any figures or information as to how pensions ranged in the early history of the country with pensions that are granted now?

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman means the rates of pension then as compared with the rates of pension now?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I should say that the rates of pension now, as a whole, are more liberal than they were in the earlier days of our history to which I have been referring, especially for disability contracted in service. There was not much difference as between different periods prior to the Civil War, but since then the rates have gradually grown more liberal. On the other hand, there was more liberality toward them in the earlier period with respect to the public domain, as I shall presently show.

AGE LAW.

The next important step in pension legislation was the act of February 6, 1907, known as the age law. The benefits of this act were confined to those who rendered the service. It was in fact both an age and a service pension act, because it fixed certain specific rates for certain ages and as in the act of 1890 a minimum service of 90 days was required. There was quite a division of sentiment in Congress on the question as to whether age or length of service should be the chief factor in fixing the rates of pension. This finally culminated in the enactment of the act of May 11, 1912, known as the Sherwood law, which was a compromise between the age and the service proponents, the act fixing rates which are governed both by age and by length of service.

Such in brief is what this Republic has done for its defenders and their dependents.

It is a splendid exhibit of the patriotism and generosity of a grateful people. I beg your indulgence now for a few moments while I discuss briefly the political history of this legislation. I earnestly desire that what I say may not be misunderstood. I speak with the utmost candor when I tell you that it always grieves me to hear the statement or the insinuation, in this body or out of it, that the thought uppermost in the minds of sworn public officials, as we are, who are dependent upon votes for retention in our places, or for advancement, as we are, is not what our duty is or what the right of the matter may be, but rather what is the most popular and calculated to get us the most votes. I undertake to say that there does not exist to-day a more insidious or a more dangerous enemy of the Republic than that sort of an estimate of public men, and I fear that it is not only too prevalent to-day for the good of the country, but that it is constantly growing. And, gentlemen, we are in a measure responsible for it ourselves—sometimes by merely indulging in a friendly and designedly harmless colloquy with each other and sometimes with sinister purpose. I share to an enthusiastic degree the estimate which our distinguished Speaker places upon the personnel of this body. It was my privilege as a public servant in an executive branch of the Government service to form the personal acquaintance of a majority of the Members of both branches of Congress, and during my service of nearly eight years here that acquaintance has necessarily been widened. I think I have had as good an opportunity as the average among you to know and to understand the motives of these men who are here earnestly toiling for the people who have honored them.

I am proud of the privilege of saying that I do not think I have come in contact with a single Member on either side of the House of any political party concerning whose honorable and patriotic purposes I have entertained the slightest doubt. I must admit that I have seen one once in awhile who was possessed of rather curious angles of vision, but they were always honest angles. I think, gentlemen, that if we were a little more just and a little more tolerant toward each other it would be better for us all and better for the country. So much by way of introduction to what I am now going to say on the political side of pension legislation. I shall endeavor to discuss it dispassionately, relying upon the cold facts of history to establish what I assert. I want to be fair to both sides. If there is one among us who can not appreciate the other fellow's side of a question, it is unfortunate that he was not broadened a little before he achieved the high honor of membership in this body.

DEMOCRATIC ANTIPATHY.

I am keeping in mind what I have just said when I make the assertion that the uniform, consistent, and unswerving course of the Republican Party has been in favor of liberal pension laws, and that since the Civil War the traditional, historical, and natural attitude of the Democratic Party as a party has been antagonistic to such laws.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman does not think that applies to the Democratic majority of this House or of the last Congress?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will wait a few minutes, I think I will enlighten him on that very point. I think it does, to a large extent. I am coming to that directly.

I shall endeavor to show why this has been logically and necessarily true—the natural outgrowth of existing conditions and the inevitable result of human sympathies and passions. For many years succeeding the Civil War Congress in both branches consisted of men who had either participated in that war or whose opinions and sentiments were still strong on one side or the other. Naturally, therefore, the attitude of parties and of individuals on the subject of pensions—a subject so closely related to that conflict—was pronounced and well defined.

The bulk of the Republican membership, which was in the majority, came almost entirely from sections of the country that were loyal to the Union. A pension was a recognition of loyal service, and of necessity was originated and supported by Republicans. It is true that a very small minority of the Democrats, reflecting their individual sentiments, voted for these measures, but these did not reflect the sentiments of their party organization. This is conclusively evidenced by the fact that on 15 important pension measures passed between the close of the Civil War and 1890 every Republican vote, 1,068 in number, was cast for these bills and not a single Republican vote cast against them; while, on the other hand, there were 648 Democratic votes cast against them and only 417 votes for them. There was another incident during this period which corroborates the statement I have made regarding the attitude of the two parties on this question. The Forty-ninth Congress was Democratic in both branches and there was a Democratic President. The Hon. Courtland C. Matson, a northern Democrat, was chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House. He brought in a dependent pension bill similar in its provisions to the act of June 27, 1890, enacted some three and one-half years later. This bill passed both Houses. Not a single Republican voted against it, the only votes that were cast against it having been cast by Democrats. President Cleveland vetoed the bill. An effort was made to pass it over the President's veto. Every Republican supported that effort, but enough Democrats voted the other way to sustain the veto, and the bill failed. When the Republicans regained control of Congress and the Presidency the act of June 27, 1890, was passed and signed by a Republican President.

The sad thought in that connection is that as a result of the delay in the enactment of that beneficent law many old soldiers and their widows suffered for the necessities of life and many others passed on to the great beyond without the recognition and assistance which the Republican Party would fain have given them and which they were denied by the action of a Democratic President and the votes of Democratic Congressmen. If I had the time, I would like to refer to the language, so unfriendly to the old soldiers, used by President Cleveland in some of his veto messages and to the many instances that came under my personal observation where their pensions were reduced and many cut off entirely as a result of the rigid and unfriendly administration of the law during his incumbency of the Presidency. Suffice it to say that thousands of veterans still living remember all about that, and they remember, too, that these pension vetoes always emanated from the pen of a Democratic President.

After the failure of the Matson bill there was more discussion throughout the country on the pension question than had occurred in any previous period of the country's history. President Cleveland's veto aroused much criticism of him and his party. Grand Army posts all over the country took the matter up, and the question of the enactment of some additional relief for the veterans of the Civil War was fully discussed at its next national encampment. The matter figured extensively in the presidential election of 1888, and the attention of voters of all parties was sharply drawn to it. The vote in Congress on the act which was passed at the next session—act of 1890—is therefore quite significant. On the roll call on the original bill in the Senate, where the measure originated, not a single Republican vote was cast against it, while only 10 Democrats voted for it. On the roll call in the House not a single Republican voted against it, while only 38 Democrats voted for it. There were 71 Democratic votes cast against it, a majority of nearly two to one of that party in the negative. The Democratic vote in the Senate on the conference report was 3 ayes and 18 noes, while every Republican Senator who was present voted "aye." The vote in the House on the conference report was equally

pronounced. Only 28 Democrats voted "aye," while 56, exactly two to one of those voting, were recorded against it. On the other hand, every Republican vote cast, 117 in number, was in the affirmative. There was no record vote in either House on the passage of the act of February 6, 1907, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows clearly that the opposition to the measure in both Houses came from Democratic sources.

Meanwhile, the veterans of the Civil War were getting well advanced in years and less able to provide for themselves, while the cost of living was constantly increasing. As a result the conviction grew stronger and stronger, both in and out of Congress, that some additional relief should be given them. In the congressional elections of 1910 this question was made one of the leading issues, particularly in the northern and border States. It is well known to those of us who are familiar with the history of that campaign that the Republican Party lost many thousands of votes because of the prevalent opinion among many veterans of the Civil War and their relatives and friends that the Republican Party, then dominant in both the legislative and executive branches of the Government, had failed to preserve its previous record of being the special champion of these veterans in not giving them the relief which they needed. Whether there was any foundation for this I shall not stop here to discuss, except to say that, in view of all the Republican Party had done for them, I do not think they were justified in casting their votes for the party which had uniformly shown such unfriendliness to their cause.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this very thorough narrative history of pension legislation. The gentleman now speaks of the campaign of 1910, where the Republican Party was generally charged throughout the North with becoming a bit unfriendly to pension legislation. What I would ask the gentleman is this—and I am not sure whether I am right or not. Previous to 1910 was there not the appearance in Congress of Republican opposition to pension legislation, where it had not existed in the past?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, perhaps that was the first time that any Republican in Congress showed opposition to pension legislation. I am going to show presently and frankly admit that there were a few—I will not say misguided Republicans, but a few Republicans who ought to have known better—who opposed the legislation which was then proposed, but they were merely a drop in the bucket as compared with the compact, organized opposition of Democracy, through all those years, to pension legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it not also true that as that slight showing on the part of some Republicans in opposition to pension legislation appeared simultaneously the solid phalanx of the Democracy which opposed pensions in the past began to break, and a great many Democrats stood for pension legislation?

Mr. LANGLEY. That was the political psychology and party expediency to which I referred in the outset. That was one thing I had in mind when I used that language.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman that I have been here a good many years, and I have never heard anyone give with completeness, such as he has, the history of pension legislation.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that compliment. I have devoted much time and thought to the subject. In the last session of the Sixty-first Congress a bill known as the Sulloway bill, which, like the preceding enactments, was both an age and a service bill, a minimum service of 90 days being required, and which granted a very liberal increase in the rates allowed these veterans, was reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions and passed by the Republican House. There was not a record vote on that bill, either, in the House, and I am willing to concede that there was less Democratic opposition to it than had been manifested toward previous pension bills. It has been contended by you Democrats that the Republican Party was responsible for the failure of that bill to pass the Senate, because, forsooth, that body had a Republican majority then; and you were able to convince many voters of the country that that contention was just. I here and now deny, and I can produce the record to sustain that denial.

It is true that there were a few Republicans in the Senate who were not favorable to the bill, just as there were in the House, but there were several test votes which showed clearly that the bill would have passed the Senate but for the rules of procedure which made it impossible with the formidable opposition to it in that body, which opposition I shall show emanated almost entirely from the Democratic membership. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows repeated efforts of Republican

Senators to get the bill considered and passed and that these efforts were blocked by Democratic Senators. I ask you to look at page 2883 of the Record of February 18, 1911. Senator Scott, of West Virginia, a Republican, asked unanimous consent to take up the bill, and Senator OVERMAN, a Democrat, from North Carolina, objected. Thereupon Senator Scott moved to take up the bill notwithstanding the objection. There were 49 votes in favor of this motion, and 46 of them were Republicans; there were 35 votes against the motion, and 28 of them were cast by Democrats. The Record also shows that the action of the Democratic Senators prevented a final vote on the passage of the bill at that time. Again, on the 4th of March following (see pages 4320-4321 of the Record), the last day of the session, and the last chance the bill had to become a law in that Congress, a Republican Senator, Mr. Curtis, of Kansas, asked unanimous consent to take up the bill, and objection was made by Mr. GORE, a Democrat, from Oklahoma. A Republican Senator then moved to take it up notwithstanding this objection, and the vote on that motion showed practically the same political alignment as it did on the other occasion referred to, on February 18. I wish that every soldier in the country and their relatives and friends knew the exact truth about the entire procedure in connection with that bill.

But you Democrats say that these things are all in the past; that while it is true that in former years we were the friend and champion of the soldiers, we finally grew indifferent to their interests and that you are now their best friends; that you passed the Sherwood bill, which is more liberal than any bill we ever passed; and that in the future, if they expect anything more in the way of legislative and administrative favor, they must look to you and to your administration. Well, let us see about that. Let us examine the Record and see what it shows in connection with the passage of the Sherwood bill. You had 225 Democratic Members in the House at that time. You had a clear Democratic majority over all parties of 69. Keeping these figures in mind, I beg you to turn to pages 284 and 285 of the Record of the second session of the Sixty-second Congress. There you will find the roll call in the House on the passage of the original Sherwood bill. There were 229 votes cast in favor of it. Of these, 97 were Democrats, 1 Independent, 1 Socialist, and 130 Republicans. There were 93 votes cast against it, 90 of whom were Democrats. There were 6 who refused to vote and answered "present," all Democrats. There were 4 Republicans and 8 Democrats paired for the bill and 2 Republicans and 10 Democrats paired against it. In other words, counting the 8 Democrats paired in favor of the bill, you could only muster 105 out of your 225 Democratic votes in this House—less than half of them—who were willing to go on record as the friends of this measure; and I suspect from what I have heard since then that some of these afterwards wished that they had taken a different course.

Now, look at page 4015 of the Senate Record of the same session. There you will find the roll call on the House bill as amended in the Senate. Every Republican vote, 40 in all, was cast for the bill, while only 11 Democrats voted for it. There were 16 Democratic votes cast against it. There was no ye-and-nay vote in the Senate on the adoption of the conference report, but there was in the House. It appears on page 6242 of the Record. There was no longer any question about the adoption of the conference report, and there was a comparatively small attendance that day, but an analysis of the vote does not help the cause of Democracy any in this connection. Of the 176 votes cast for the report only 77 were cast by Democrats, while of the 57 negative votes 56 were Democrats. The other negative vote was cast by the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT], of whose present political alignment I am not advised. Every Republican who was present and voted voted for the report. There were 98 of these.

What a "magnificent and unanswerable" exhibit in support of your contention that you of Democracy have become the residuary legatee of the honor which once belonged to the Republican Party of being the special friend and champion of the soldier! Really, gentlemen, you ought to be ashamed of yourselves for having the effrontery to make such a claim and expect people versed in the history of our country to believe it, when the record shows that at no time when you had control of Congress could you muster enough votes to pass a pension bill without the aid of Republicans, and when it also shows that the Sherwood bill, for which you claim so much credit, received less than 100 Democratic votes, when it took 193 votes to make a quorum of the House, and that if the real friends of the soldiers, the Republicans, had not rallied to the support of the bill, it would have been overwhelmingly defeated in the House of its alleged friends.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that while the House was Democratic the Senate was Republican and the President was Republican, and it was a Republican President who signed the bill?

Mr. LANGLEY. I am going to call attention to that in a moment in another connection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota to yield me 15 minutes more.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 minutes more.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not know what foundation you have for the contention that the soldiers of the country must look to a Democratic administration for favorable consideration hereafter. Surely there is nothing in the record of previous Democratic administrations to base it on. As to what the present Democratic President may do I can not, of course, foretell. He has not had occasion to do anything since he has been President to show his attitude on the pension question. He did, however, express himself upon it some years ago. Here is what he said in his book entitled "Division and Reunion" (p. 227):

The other leading questions of those years were the granting of pensions and the regulation of immigration. Congress had hastened from one lavish vote to another in providing pensions for the soldiers who had fought in the Civil War, until at length generosity had passed into folly. President Cleveland, for the time, put a stop to the reckless process by a vigorous use of his veto power.

This is a little flash-light photograph of what was going on in the mind of Prof. Thomas Woodrow Wilson long after he had reached the age of maturity. I am tolerably familiar with his history during the ensuing years of his eventful progress from the college halls to the White House, and I know nothing that has occurred during that period that would reform the sentiments of his heart or revise the logic of his brain upon this question. [Applause.] He thought then that the pittance which was allowed these old heroes by the altogether too tardy action of Congress was "hastening from one lavish vote to another"; that the act of June 27, 1890, which he evidently had in mind and which allowed them 30 or 40 cents a day to support themselves and their families, was "generosity" to a degree that justified him in calling it "folly," and that Congress was engaged in a "reckless process" when it did this; and he was manifestly gratified over the fact that President Cleveland made such a "vigorous use of his veto power" in preventing them from getting a few more cents a day to help keep the wolf from the door. How proud I am that I never cast my vote for a man who could harbor in his heart such sentiments toward these helpless old men who did so much for our country.

I beg to remind you that not only the Sherwood bill would have failed to pass if it had not received the support of the Republicans, but that it was passed by a Republican Senate and signed by a Republican President. And yet you Democrats claim and made hundreds of thousands of people believe that President Taft was opposed to and would veto such a bill. I wonder if there is a soldier in the country, or anyone else for that matter, who believes that if the Sherwood bill had not been passed until Woodrow Wilson became President he would have signed such a bill, even if he had permitted Congress to pass it, which I very much doubt. [Laughter.]

No, Mr. Chairman; you can not change the facts of history any more than a leopard can change its spots, and those facts show beyond the possibility of contradiction that up to this good day your party as a party is not entitled to the credit which its leaders have claimed as the friend and champion of the soldiers of the country. They show, on the contrary, that the Republican Party, both in Congress and in the administration of the Pension Bureau, has steadfastly adhered to its unbroken policy of justice, equity, and liberality to the defenders of the Nation and their dependents, while the Democratic Party, as a party, has just as consistently adhered to its time-honored policy of opposition to pensions. As I have already conceded, there are some notable individual exceptions to this. These exceptions embrace several classes of Democrats. First, there are those Democrats who represent northern constituencies, where the soldier element and their relatives and friends are numerous. These men believe in pensions and honestly support a liberal pension system. They represent the wishes of their constituents, as it is their duty to do. Again, there are some old men from the South, whose views time has changed and whose hearts age has softened. These men have a genuine and hearty desire, unmixed with prejudice, to be just and liberal toward the old soldiers. Whatever of animosity these men may

have formerly felt has been buried. Then there are some young men from the South, who were either too young during the Civil War to remember its hardships and animosities or who were born since the war and are free, more or less, from its prejudices and passions.

These view the subject from a more practical standpoint and are actuated by mixed motives of generosity and political as well as governmental expediency. There is still another class who, while personally believing in the old-time Democratic policy of antagonism to pensions, are nevertheless willing for the sake of their Democratic brethren in soldier districts to yield their own judgment and forego their natural inclination to vote against pension measures for the supposed political advantage that will accrue to the Democratic Party as a whole. Such was not their attitude, however, when the great preponderance of Democratic voting strength came from the solid South. In making up this classification I have run across still another subdivision among the membership of this body. This consists of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who on this subject is sui generis. [Laughter.] Judging from his various utterances, to which I have always listened attentively, he belongs in a class by himself. He has said many things in these pension debates with which I wholly disagree and some things that I thought were extremely unkind and unjust to the soldiers and pensioners of the country; but I am in hearty accord with what he has said about giving equal and exact justice to all of them, and if my time will permit me, I desire before closing to point out some instances in which this has not been done. There is another thing that I wish in all candor and fairness to say here. I want to give credit to the present Democratic régime in this body for not packing the Committee on Invalid Pensions, of which I have the pleasure and honor to be a member, so as to have a majority of it antagonistic to dealing justly and liberally with this question. Two or three of the Democratic membership of that committee have hardly ever attended any of its meetings and have taken practically no part in its work. As to these I can not speak with personal knowledge, but as to those who have actively participated with us in the work of the committee I cheerfully bear testimony that, almost without exception, they are men of broad and liberal minds and generous hearts, and in dealing with the various cases that have come before us they have exercised to the fullest the equitable jurisdiction with which the committee was vested when this House created it. I shall cherish throughout my life the memory of my cordial and most congenial association with them. [Applause.]

And, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be entirely just and fair toward all other Democratic Members of this body, and I should deeply regret it were I to inaccurately state any fact or draw any unwarranted conclusion as to their attitude on this great question. As in all other things, there are underlying conditions which account for the movements of congressional sentiment on this pension subject which are naturally and logically responsible for the results produced. I have already mentioned some of these—time's effect on the animosities and prejudices of the Civil War; the change in personnel, bringing a younger and newer element on the scene, and the obligation which some individuals feel to yield their personal inclination to party fealty. There are still other important and potential reasons for the changed attitude of individual Democrats. The population is shifting constantly and likewise the distribution of pension money, whereas formerly the beneficiaries of our pension law were nearly all located in the States that remained in the Union. Now they are scattered all over the land, the States of the South almost without exception containing thousands of pensioners, survivors and dependents of the soldiers of three wars. It may be surprising to some of you to know that there is nearly \$400,000 more pension money paid to citizens of Texas than is paid to those of Vermont, more in Georgia than in Delaware, more in each of the States of Louisiana and Florida than in the State of Rhode Island, twice as much in the State of Virginia as in Rhode Island, and a million and a half more in Tennessee than in Connecticut. These figures show, I think, one reason for the greater liberality manifested toward the pension system by some of our younger Democratic friends from the South. They show, among other things, the political wisdom and economic foresight of some of our Democratic brethren either in voting for liberal pensions or else withholding their opposition thereto.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there were more pensions paid in the State of Georgia than in the State of Connecticut?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; I said that there was more pension money paid in Georgia than in the State of Delaware, and more in Tennessee by a million and a half dollars than in the State of Connecticut.

Mr. BARTLETT. And more in Texas than in what State?

Mr. LANGLEY. More in Texas than in the State of Vermont.

Mr. EAGLE. You could put the whole population of Vermont into one county in Texas.

Mr. LANGLEY. That may be, but it does not affect the point that I am making, however.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman knows that in comparing Georgia with Delaware, it was very difficult to get soldiers into the Army from Delaware, and very few went into the Army from that State. It is a very small State.

Mr. LANGLEY. Oh, I take it for granted that everybody knows the geography of the country and the relative size of the various States and their population. I am not seeking to conceal anything about that.

Mr. BARTLETT. You could put Delaware in the county in which I live.

Mr. LANGLEY. That may be true also. I am not advised as to that. I am simply trying to show an excuse for some of you changing your minds lately. More of the money is going south.

But shift as Democratic sentiment may, like the sands of the sea; shift as population and pension disbursements may, to account for much of the eleventh-hour change of heart of individual Democrats on this question; shift as sectional Democratic strength may, creating political exigencies to harass those who act for the sake of expediency alone, the large, overshadowing, convincing fact of the history of pension legislation remains unchanged and unchangeable, that the Republican Party, in season and out, in good and evil report, in power and out of power, has been the constant advocate of and has held tenaciously to the doctrine, policy, and practice of liberal pensions to those who fought under the Stars and Stripes in every conflict into which our flag has been carried. [Applause.]

On the other hand, taking the Democratic organization as a whole, the fact that the dominant power and influence of Democracy is and has always been, particularly since the Civil War, wielded against pension legislation stands uncontradicted and incontrovertible. The Sherwood bill, even, was wrung by political exigency from the unwilling hands of those of you who were really against it and could have prevented its passage. Upon the faces of many of you I could see written that sullen determination born of the resolve toward your Democratic brethren of the North which, put into polite English, meant: "This time, but no more—thus far shalt thou go, and no farther."

MONTHLY PAYMENT BILL.

If I had the time I should like to cite some things that have occurred during this Congress which confirm my contention that the Democratic Party is not as friendly to the soldier as it professes to be. I will mention an instance or two in passing. Pensioners all over the country are put at a disadvantage because they have to wait three months before getting their pension checks. They have to discount their quarterly payments, often at excessive rates, or keep running accounts with merchants, and it goes without saying that they do not always get articles on a cash basis. Moreover, there are a great many people who do not understand that accrued pension due at date of death is available to pay the expenses of the last sickness and burial, and many times an old soldier does not get the benefits of his pension during the last days of his life, when he most needs it. They have asked for a monthly payment law, but your Democratic leaders are holding it back because they say it will cost too much. Again the law gives preference to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors and their widows in the matter of appointment and retention in office, and yet it is a matter of common knowledge that this law is being flagrantly violated under the present administration. I shall, however, take occasion at another time to discuss this and to give specific instances.

There is a lesson to be learned from all this by the soldiers of the country, their relatives, and friends. I might say rather that it is an object lesson of what they may expect from the Democratic Party in the years to come if it should remain in power. That party controls both branches of Congress, and perhaps the Presidency also, because of an almost solid Democratic South added to the inroads it has made in the Northern States. Indeed, the Democratic membership of this House is now almost equally balanced between the North and the South. No conservative, well-informed student of the political history of our country will deny that sooner or later the political pendulum

will swing the other way—in fact, it has already begun to swing—and that this will result in the reduction in the Democratic membership almost entirely from the Northern States. As this process of reduction goes on the relative power of the South, already in the saddle in the councils of Democracy, will necessarily be increased. The South being the seat of antipathy to pensions will, of course, control the policy of the party on that question, and in view of the rapid, and I might add alarming, growth of the power of King Caucus the continued control of Congress by Democracy bodes no good for the future of our pension system. My advice to the soldiers of the country and to all those who are interested in or are advocates of the continuance of our liberal pension policy is to exercise the power which they have and see to it that while the Democracy of the South is thus returning to supreme control in the councils of that party it be likewise put in the minority in this and the other branch of Congress where it can not do any harm. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If time permitted, I would like to reply to some of the unjust things that have been said in this House during this session about the soldiers and pensioners of the country. Shame upon you gentlemen, and especially you of Texas whose people have been the greatest sufferers from the brutality and inhumanity of Mexicans, for what you have said about pension grabbers and about the pension roll being a roll of dishonor and of graft. Scarcely had the echo of your bitter invective died away before the blood of our brave young men was crimsoning the soil of Mexico. Well may you cease this unjust criticism in the face of this new evidence of the patriotism and valor of our soldiers and sailors. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, every dollar that a government spends for pensions makes that government just that much stronger among its citizenship. The money goes into every channel of trade, and in numerous instances prevents a ward of the nation from being placed upon the charity of the community or State in which he lives. I can think of nothing more deplorable than for a man who has defended his country's flag in his young manhood and vigor to enter a poorhouse after he has, by reason of age or disability, become unable to earn a livelihood. I hope to live to see the day when every man who has been a soldier, sailor, or marine, who has offered or stood ready to offer his life—the supremest of human sacrifices—for his country's honor, will be allowed a pension when he is unable to labor for his support, whether that condition resulted from his service or otherwise. Many young men went to Cuba and the Philippines and came back broken in health and have been invalids ever since, but on account of the technical requirements as to proof, the absence of hospital records, and his inability to find his scattered comrades who were with him in those distant lands he has been denied a pension on the ground of his inability to prove that his disability was of service origin.

PRACTICE TOO RIGID.

Some gentlemen seem to think that it is a very easy matter to get a pension allowed in the Pension Office. I worked as a clerk in that office for several years and I know better. Thousands of claims are rejected when there is no record in the War Department of the disability alleged and no medical evidence showing its existence at date of discharge or for some time thereafter. Many a faithful soldier has been denied a pension that he deserved because he stayed out of the hospital and therefore has no hospital record to sustain his claim. For several years it has been the practice in the Pension Office to reject claims on the ground I have just stated.

Frequently a soldier's statement at discharge that he was not disabled is quoted in contradiction of his subsequent allegation that he was, and his failure to claim pension promptly after he left the service is also made the basis of a presumption adverse to his claim refuting evidence that would otherwise be sufficient to establish it. I look upon the Pension Office as a great court. It ought to be a court of justice and liberality. It decides more cases than any other court in our land. It is supposed to decide a case upon the evidence alone, but I can show you wherein it often fails to do that. For example, take a claim for rheumatism. The claimant waited 40 years before filing. He alleges that during the Garfield campaign in 1862, on the Big Sandy River, near Pikeville, Ky., he underwent great exposure, resulting in rheumatism; that it affected his legs and arms and shoulders; that at times he could not walk on account of it; that he was not treated in a hospital for it, but that he got liniment and applied it himself; that this disease troubled him at times during the remainder of his service and continued after he got home; that it prevented him from following his occupation regularly; that he got treatment from two or three

physicians from time to time, but that they are all dead; that for the remainder of the time he used home remedies; that he delayed applying for a pension because he did not need it then.

The Pension Office gives him an order to go before a board of surgeons for examination and at the same time calls on him for proof to establish the claim. The board examines him and finds rheumatism. He finally locates two or three of his comrades, who swear that they remember that he had rheumatism in the service about the time he alleges; that his limbs and joints were swollen; that they saw him using liniment; that he was excused at times on account of this trouble, which still existed at the time of his discharge. He furnishes the affidavits of neighbors who have lived near him and have known him ever since the war, and they swear that he has been troubled with rheumatism every year since the war. In due time he will receive a letter which reads something like this:

Your claim based on rheumatism is rejected on the ground of no record in the War Department; no medical or other satisfactory evidence showing origin in service, existence at discharge, or continuance since, and your evident inability to furnish such evidence.

Feeling the injustice of this action, he gets still other testimony to corroborate that already filed, but he is curtly advised in reply that this additional evidence has been considered and does not warrant a reopening of the claim. If the witnesses in support of such a claim are shown to be persons of credibility I contend that it is unjust to reject such a claim. There are many disabilities, like rheumatism, as to the existence of which a layman is a competent witness as well as a physician. I do not underestimate the importance of getting the best testimony possible in such cases, nor do I overlook the rule of evidence requiring it, but I am convinced that thousands of just claims have been rejected and stand rejected to-day because of the enforcement of this altogether too rigid rule.

Many years ago Congress passed a law providing for the employment of special examiners whose duty it was supposed to be to aid the claimants in locating witnesses, they being oftentimes unable to provide the expense of doing so themselves, and thereby help them to establish the claim when it was just. I have no hesitancy in saying that in my judgment a majority of those special examiners failed to try to do what Congress intended. They would catechize a witness in such a way as to frighten him and make him forget what he really did know. I know of cases in which they would tell a witness that he was not a physician, and was therefore not capable of diagnosing a disease, and would finally get from him and put in the report of his testimony virtually an admission that he knew nothing about the case. In this way many meritorious cases have been defeated when if due weight had been given to the testimony of a man's neighbors and associates, who could recognize rheumatism, sore eyes, and various other disabilities that I could name, just as well as a physician could, they would have been allowed. Of course, many special examiners did not do this, but tried their best to get at the actual merits of the claims. I am not charging that these things have happened under any particular administration. I mention them in support of my contention that the Government in administering the pension laws has not been as liberal or as just in pension cases as a court of justice in the circumstances ought to have been.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Congress in waiting 25 years, as it did, before granting pensions to disabled soldiers and sailors without requiring proof of service origin of disability waited entirely too long. Judging from what some of our Democratic friends have said on the subject, it is evident that they think we should wait at least that long before pensioning our soldiers, sailors, and marines who have fought our battles since the Civil War. It has now been 16 years since our War with Spain. I know of many who participated in that war who are now unable to earn a support and who can not prove that their disability was contracted in the service. I think we have waited long enough in their cases, and I for one am ready to vote for a bill to pension these men who served their country and are now unable to work and are in need of assistance without requiring them to prove the origin of their disability. I am aware that the edict has gone forth from Democratic leaders in this body that no more general pension legislation is to be considered at this session, and therefore it is useless to take the matter up now; but I give notice that we will do so next winter. Gentlemen say that it will cost too much. I do not know how much it might cost; I have not figured on that. The first question is, do they need it and do they deserve it? I say they do, and I am willing to give it to them, regardless of its cost, and thus show to the nations of the world that our Treasury stands back of our needy and disabled defenders. To

those who are worrying about the cost of it let me say that at each stage of the expansion of our liberal pension policy the same worrying has been indulged in, and yet the country has met it all and still prospers.

I have said before in this House, and I want to say it again, that if for the time being our revenues should not be sufficient to meet the expense of providing adequately for all those who are so richly entitled to the Nation's gratitude and bounty, I would gladly vote for the issue of bonds to meet it, and when the next generation reads the glorious story of the struggles of these men, and when their hearts swell with pride and patriotism as they think of the rich heritage of which our Republic is possessed in consequence of their service, I know they will thank us for giving them the privilege and the honor of paying their share of tribute to these heroes and their dependents.

In connection with the cost of paying all these pensions, I beg to remind you that more than a hundred of the old soldiers of the Civil War are dying every day. Nearly 40,000 answered the last roll call in 1913. Nearly all of them have now reached three score and ten, the allotted life of man in Holy Writ. The death rate will be much greater this year than last, and it will grow greater year by year so rapidly that within a decade there will be but a tottering remnant left of that magnificent band of young men who returned gallantly and triumphantly to their homes after the news from Appomattox foretold the matchless destiny of a reunited Republic. [Applause.] Already the effect of this rapid death rate is manifest by the amount carried by this bill, which is over \$11,000,000 less than the appropriation of last year. When I think of the old fellows and their widows who have passed away without getting what they needed for their comfort in the closing days of their lives, and of those who are yet tottering on the brink of the grave in need of attention and the necessities of life, it grieves me to see the pension appropriation reduced. I would like to see it kept high enough and long enough to not only keep the wolf from the door of every veteran of the Civil War, his widow, and dependents, but to bring the sunshine of comfort into the home of every one of these old heroes and keep it there so long as we are honored with his presence in this world.

PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. Chairman, I have already referred to the fact that the policy of our Government, originating in colonial days, of granting public lands to the defenders of the country has been abandoned, and that the only advantage given for service in our wars since 1855 has been to credit the service on the period of actual residence required. In other words, a Civil War veteran, however old and feeble he may be, has to establish an actual residence on the land, and maintain it for at least a year, and in many instances much longer, before he can acquire title to it. It is impossible for him to do this now, and this provision of law is therefore a nullity so far as the veterans of the Civil War are concerned. We have hundreds of millions of acres of public unappropriated lands, much of which the Government could easily spare. I am in favor of returning to the earlier policy of the Nation by making some feasible distribution of a part of these lands among the veterans of the Civil War without requiring them to establish a residence thereon.

CHARGE OF DESERTION.

There is a class of soldiers of the Civil War who are unjustly denied a pension. I refer to those who are charged with desertion, because of their failure to return to their commands when, as a matter of fact, they had not the slightest intention to desert. Scores of such cases have come to my personal attention of men who were absent from their commands under proper military authority and were taken sick, or cut off by the enemy, or prevented by some other insurmountable obstacle from returning to duty. I know of many cases in the mountains of Kentucky where conditions were such as to render return to duty impossible and where a report to the commanding officer was equally impossible, and yet these men stand charged with desertion and can not get a pension. You may answer that there is a general law under which this charge can be removed by the War Department; but what is that law?

It provides, for instance, that where a soldier was prevented from returning to duty by disability he must not only prove the fact that such disability prevented him from returning, but that the disability was incurred in the service and line of duty. He might prove conclusively that it was beyond human possibility for him to return, and yet that will not avail him anything. He might prove that after he got home on furlough he contracted typhoid fever and was bedfast and helpless until his command was mustered out of service, and yet the War

Department, under the law, would not remove the charge, because he could not prove that he contracted typhoid fever in the service, and he could not prove it because it was not true. I could cite cases where soldiers were unable to return to duty because they were prisoners of war at the time, and I know of one instance where it was shown that the reason the soldier could not return to his command was because he was dead, and yet the charge of desertion still stood. Such a law is ridiculous and absurd, and yet it seems impossible to get it amended or to get relief for these men in any other way, and whenever we make the effort the cry that we are proposing to pension deserters is raised. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to pensioning deserters myself, just as much as anyone else is, but I do not concede that Congress can not draft a law which would do justice without rewarding anyone unjustly. I, for one, would rather see a score of those not entitled receive a pension than to have one who is entitled denied that right.

WIDOWS MARRIED SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 27, 1890.

Another instance of injustice in our present pension system is the provision which denies pension to those widows who married the soldier or sailor subsequent to June 27, 1890. I remember very well the discussion which led up to the enactment of that provision. It was well known that in many instances young women married soldiers who were well advanced in years and whose physical condition made it evident that they would not live for a great while, so that these young women acquired a pensionable status without having made the sacrifices which constituted the primary purpose of Congress in providing widows' pensions. It was to stop this practice of taking advantage of these old men that the provision referred to was enacted. The very fact that this law existed when marriages since that date took place eliminates the real reason for its enactment. It has now been in force for nearly a quarter of a century and there are thousands of cases of widows like this where they have lived with the soldier for many years, and in some cases, of course, nearly a quarter of a century, and have nursed and cared for him to the end. To deny pension in such cases is a great injustice. Indeed, Congress has repeatedly acknowledged that injustice by granting pension in many such cases by special act. But to grant pensions in some cases and deny them in others equally deserving only adds the injustice of discrimination to the injustice which the law itself does. We ought to repeal that limitation and make provision for the deserving cases of widows which it denies a pension. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I have never felt that \$12 a month is enough pension to give to those widows of the Civil War who married the soldier before or during the service and who had all of the anxieties and burdens that fell upon them while the husband was absent in the service of his country.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would please excuse me at this time. At the conclusion of my remarks I would be very glad to yield to him.

The history of the Civil War is filled with soul-stirring instances of their trials and their heroism. We ought to give them a substantial increase. Indeed, I would support a proposition which would increase the pension of all Civil War widows, especially when they are disabled and needy and who therefore come within the class of those to whom we do grant relief by special act. That would be simply a matter of justice.

STATE MILITIA ORGANIZATIONS.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to discuss the question of granting a pension to members of State militia organizations who aided in the suppression of the Rebellion, although never actually mustered into the service of the United States, and it is still my purpose to do so, but on a later date. I have addressed the House on this subject several times since I have been a Member of it, but I have always done so in connection with other pension matters. This time I propose to discuss that question alone, and in the near future I shall ask you to hear me upon it and I think I can convince you with the evidence that I have accumulated that the delay of Congress in recognizing the great service that these old men rendered the country is not only unpardonable, but an act of ingratitude that ought to put it to shame. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia desired to ask me a question, I believe? I shall take pleasure in yielding, if I have any time left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has just half a minute remaining.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I can not ask the question in that time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Very well.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day, and for other purposes.

PENSIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman from Georgia used?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour and thirty-six minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to address the House at this late hour in the day, and while my remarks do not deal precisely with the bill we are now considering, they are upon a subject that is now engaging the attention of the American people and the American Congress, a subject that is not equalled by any other except the Mexican situation, and I refer to the contest now being waged for the repeal of the Panama tolls, with a slight reference to the bill we have just considered, the question of battleships.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of two battleships, and would vote for more. I do this in order to uphold our national dignity and to keep pace in a halting way with the leading nations of the earth which talk "peace" and build battleships. England at the present time is constructing 15 dreadnaughts and battle cruisers carrying large guns of the dreadnaught type and fit for first-line duty; Russia, 11; Germany, 9; France, 9; Japan, 7; and Italy, 7; while we are building and have under construction only 5 in the United States. As a sample of what negligence or inattention along this line means we have only to refer to China, with a population of 450,000,000 people and building no dreadnaughts. It is having its country divided and parceled out to the other stronger nations of the world.

I have another reason why I am in favor of more battleships. We are constructing the world's most famous engineering feat ever undertaken by the ingenuity of man. I want to see our battleships go through this canal tolls free, and then, according to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, as voted by this House, under the claim of "entire equality" to all nations, have other nations try to get their battleships through this canal tolls free.

Mr. Chairman, I herewith incorporate the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty affecting the use of the canal, the law exempting tolls, and the bill to repeal that law, as a part of my remarks:

ARTICLE 3.

The United States adopts, as the basis of the neutralization of such ship canal, the following rules, substantially as embodied in the convention of Constantinople, signed the 28th October, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Canal, that is to say:

1. The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

2. The canal shall never be blockaded nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual nor take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay in accordance with the regulations in force and with only such intimation as may result from the necessities of the service. Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same rules as vessels of war of the belligerents.

4. No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war, or warlike materials in the canal, except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

5. The provisions of this article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal within 3 marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than 24 hours at any one time, except in case of distress, and in such case shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within 24 hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

6. The plant, establishments, buildings, and all works necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be part thereof for the purposes of this treaty, and in time of war, as in time of peace, shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal. (Entered into Nov. 18, 1901.)

Law passed by Congress:

SEC. 5. That the President is hereby authorized to prescribe and from time to time change the tolls that shall be levied by the Government of the United States for the use of the Panama Canal: *Provided*, That no tolls, when prescribed as above, shall be changed unless six months' notice thereof shall have been given by the President by proclamation. No tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States. That section 4132 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows: (Approved Aug. 24, 1912.)

Section 1 of the act to repeal the exemption clause of the above statute passed the House March 31, 1914, and now being considered in the Senate provides:

An act to amend section 5 of "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912.

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence in section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912, which reads as follows: "No tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

I want to see if under the "entire equality provision" claimed by the majority, if we charge tolls to foreign battleships for passing through the canal whether we must also charge our own battleships tolls.

I want to see whether or not we can take tolls from our own battleships and merchantmen on entering the canal and pay that toll back to them at the other end when they come out, and then apply this rule of "entire equality" to all the nations of the earth, and see whether or not those nations will exact that this same ridiculous performance of charging vessels tolls on going in and giving it back to them on coming out will meet this "entire equality" to all nations in the use of our canal.

I want to see whether or not we can hold the warships of other nations for 24 hours before they will be permitted to pass through the canal, and we ad libitum under this "entire equality" of use to all nations of the canal pass our warships through.

I want to see whether or not under the "equalization" claim of the majority of this House if we can victual, unload, or embark soldiers on our boats in our canal and deny this right to other nations.

I want to see whether or not under the construction claimed by the friends of "equalization" we can land our troops in the Canal Zone from our own warships and unload our merchandise and war supplies in the zone and other merchandise belonging to the United States and deny this right to the other nations of the earth, conforming to the rules of the treaty. Mr. Chairman, it can not be done. In other words, who does the canal belong to anyway?

The President of the United States himself, before election, was unequivocally in favor of free tolls to our American coastwise shipping, and so stated.

Speaking of this provision in the Democratic platform, President Wilson, at Washington Park, N. J., on August 5, 1912, said:

"One of the great objects in cutting that great ditch across the Isthmus of Panama is to allow farmers who are near the Atlantic to ship to the Pacific by way of the Atlantic ports.

"Now, at present there are no ships to do that, and one of the bills pending—passed, I believe, yesterday by the Senate as it had passed the House—provides for free tolls for American ships through that canal, and prohibits any ship from passing through which is owned by any American railroad company.

"You see the object of that, don't you? We don't want the railroads to compete with themselves, because we understand that kind of competition. We want water carriage to compete with land carriage, so as to be perfectly sure that you are going to get better rates around the canal than you would across the continent.

"Our platform is not molasses to catch flies. It means business. It means what it says. It is the utterance of earnest and honest men, who intend to do business along those lines and who are not waiting to see whether they can catch votes with those promises before they determine whether they are going to act upon them or not."

It is no credit to the great President of the United States nor the high office he holds to change front, turn his coat, and want us to deliver up our sovereignty over the canal. To me it looks like a stain on our national honor and a blow at the dignity of the great American people.

I want to see what becomes of the plank in the Democratic platform upon which a great national election was won, which provides:

We favor the exemption from toll of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal.

And this was the position of the other great parties supported strongly by the will and wish of a majority of the American people.

I would like to know whether or not the American people would have ever stood for the expense of building the Panama Canal at a cost of \$400,000,000 if they knew it was to be supervised, dictated, controlled, or interfered with by any other nation on earth. The rate of tolls now charged will not pay one-half the upkeep; that is doing enough for other nations.

I want to know whether or not my colleague, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, would convey to Great Britain the Territory of Alaska in order to appease England or any other nation on earth to waive its interest in the Panama Canal?

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 258) providing for the repeal of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty as one of the conditions of the proposed transfer of southeastern Alaska to Canada.

Whereas the Hay-Pauncefote treaty has proved to be, and will continue to be, a source of dispute, and therefore of irritation, to the people of the United States; and

Whereas the narrow coast strip of southeastern Alaska, keeping one-third of western Canada from free access to the Pacific, is a source of irritation to the people of Canada; and

Whereas in the interest of the peace movement, especially for the sake of example, it is desirable that all sources of international irritation be removed whenever possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to negotiate with the British and Canadian Governments regarding the transfer of southeastern Alaska to Canada by sale or exchange, or both, the repeal of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty being made one of the conditions of transfer.

Why does he not offer to convey or "cede" the great State of Maryland instead of Alaska? Maryland was named after a British Queen, and its principal metropolis, Baltimore, is named after one of the greatest of British lords, who obtained a proprietary right to this great State from Charles I. I do not think my colleague from Maryland voices the sentiment of all the "Smiths," not even of the "John Smiths." We bought Alaska from Russia for a mere pittance of \$7,200,000, and we have already received from this rich Territory the stupendous sum of \$464,000,000 in its products, without so much as even beginning to deplete its resources; in fact, the riches of Alaska are bewildering; and since it was ceded to us for such a pittance, it would be more in harmony with exact justice and "entire equality" to all nations on earth for us to give it back to Russia instead of to England.

I now see a merchantman loaded at New York or Galveston plying the Mississippi River duty free and unloading at St. Louis without tolls.

I want to see that same vessel and cargo loaded at the same ports and pass through the Panama Canal to San Francisco under "entire equality" to ourselves and to our own people, canal tolls free; that would look like "entire equality" to ourselves.

If a merchantman must pay tolls to ply the canal, then the rate paid must be added to the cost of the article and, in familiar Democratic vernacular, be paid by the consumer. The coastwise man can not pay the tolls of his ship and cargo out of his own pocket, but if he pays for transport through the canal he must get his money back, and this amount will be charged to the transport of the commodity and ultimately paid by the consumer.

I want to find out what nation, if any, is complaining about free tolls to our American coastwise shipping through our canal. I have listened attentively to the speeches and arguments made, and have concluded that there is not a nation on earth, England not excepted, that has made a formal protest against free use of the canal to our coastwise trade.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. I will also call to the gentleman's attention the fact that the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in a speech the other day stated positively that there were no foreign complications, as far as he knew.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I am very much obliged for the remark. I have read during the interim that a fund of \$30,000 has been expended by Mr. Carnegie, and that 750,000 speeches of one of the most distinguished Senators in the Congress of the United States have been sent under Government frank, mailed free, broadcast throughout our land to work up a sentiment against free tolls to our coastwise American shipping. I would listen to the condemnation of the great American people if such a propaganda were carried on by the friends of free tolls; "it would resound to heaven."

I want to see how our Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, can give free tonnage and free everything else to the State of Panama and to the State of Colombia, under this "entire equality" use of the canal to all nations of the earth, and deny this privilege to the United States.

I would like to know what nation on earth has subscribed to the rules allowing or permitting it to use the canal under the terms of the treaty on "entire equality," and what share of the expense and upkeep they agree to pay. It will not be Panama nor Colombia.

[From the Washington Post, Wednesday, May 6, 1914.]

COLOMBIA SPEEDS TREATY—FACT BY WHICH UNITED STATES IS TO PAY \$25,000,000 PASSES FIRST READING.

BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, May 5.

The treaty between Colombia and the United States, settling the long-standing dispute over Panama, passed its first reading in the Colombian Senate to-day.

The treaty provides that Colombia shall enjoy freely and in perpetuity free passage through the Panama Canal for her troops and warships, and stipulates also that six months after the exchange of ratifications the sum of \$25,000,000 shall be paid to Colombia.

Who is to determine and enforce these rules and requirements? Why should the American Nation construct the canal? Why should it police it, care for it, defend it in perpetuity, without sovereignty, privileges, or control?

Why did we permit 47,000,000 tons to pass through St. Marys Canal tolls free last year, and now complain because our American shippers would forsooth carry 1,000,000 tons duty free through the Panama Canal, which they likewise helped to construct?

Where is the exact and equal terms and that high and lofty justice, love of humanity, and regard toward all nations sitting, when England charges American vessels for entering her canal a much higher rate than we charge English merchantmen for entering ours? There were shipped through the Suez Canal 16,581,898 tons of merchandise in 1910. What great advantage, abuse, or hatred toward England is found in the fact that we pay \$1.30 a ton for shipping merchandise through the Suez Canal and have fixed a rate of \$1.20 a ton for merchandise to be shipped through our Panama Canal, although in that I might, if I adopt the "equalization" scheme, be more exact to call it "the American and English Panama Canal"? The question of ship subsidy has taken on great proportions in the consideration of the rates for this canal, but was voted without dissent in the Underwood tariff bill in allowing 5 per cent rebate to imports carried on American ships. Why is this not attacked for violation of ship subsidy?

That a discount of 5 per cent on all duties imposed by this act shall be allowed on such goods, wares, and merchandise as shall be imported in vessels admitted to registration under the laws of the United States.

Ship subsidy in 1914 was ship subsidy in 1912 when this tolls act was passed by a majority of this House voting for this bill, which it is sought to repeal now.

SUBSIDY.

Was it ship subsidy to expend \$260,000,000 in the last six years for our rivers and harbors?

Is it river subsidy to expend \$300,000,000 for the improvement of the Mississippi River?

Is it cotton subsidy to expend \$1,000,000 for the eradication of the boll weevil?

Is it cattle subsidy to expend Government revenue for the eradication of the cattle tick?

Is expending \$25,000,000 for highways an automobile subsidy?

Is everything a person opposes to be dominated "subsidy and graft"?

Is paying a duty to other nations on our exports while we admit their exports into our country free of duty a foreign subsidy?

When a State receives more revenue from the Government than the Government receives from the State, is that a State subsidy?

Is paying higher wages to American labor than is paid by foreign countries to their laborers a labor subsidy?

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the way in which we secured the Panama Canal Zone. To those careful critics I refer them to a perusal of the way in which England secured control and sovereignty over the Suez Canal—to an article found in the Fortnightly Review of September, 1893, entitled "England's right to the Suez shares," by Mr. Whitehouse, which will tell the story. The canal strictly was an asset of the Egyptian Government. It was pawned in 1876 by Ismail Pasha, Khedive of Egypt, for the purpose of procuring a private loan, and taken over by England on a forfeiture of the pledge of \$20,000,000. Mr. Whitehouse says the shares belonged to Egypt, but were pledged by Ismail, and further, that "the transaction of 1876 belongs to a class against which a court of equity has never failed to give relief." The use of public property to pay a private debt is not unquestionable, it can not be done. Mr.

W. S. Blunt, in his work entitled "Secret history of the English occupation of Egypt," in an eloquent plea for the rights of the Egyptians, denounces the robberies which the English Government has perpetrated on the Egyptians, and said:

If you do not think the Egyptian needs the money, which we as a nation have taken from him, go look at his ribs.

I would like to know what is secreted and covered up in the President's message to the great Congress of the United States when he told us to repeal the tolls law to our American coastwise shipping whether it is right or wrong, and I now insert that message:

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES DELIVERED AT A JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS MARCH 5, 1914.

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS: I have come to you upon an errand which can be very briefly performed, but I beg that you will not measure its importance by the number of sentences in which I state it. No communication I have addressed to the Congress carried with it graver or more far-reaching implications as to the interest of the country, and I come now to speak upon a matter with regard to which I am charged in a peculiar degree, by the Constitution itself, with personal responsibility.

I have come to ask you for the repeal of that provision of the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States from payment of tolls, and to urge upon you the justice, the wisdom, and the large policy of such a repeal with the utmost earnestness of which I am capable.

In my own judgment, very fully considered and maturely formed, that exemption constitutes a mistaken economic policy from every point of view, and is, moreover, in plain contravention of the treaty with Great Britain concerning the canal concluded on November 18, 1901. But I have not come to urge upon you my personal views. I have come to state to you a fact and a situation. Whatever may be our own differences of opinion concerning this much debated measure, its meaning is not debated outside the United States. Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal. We consented to the treaty; its language we accepted, if we did not originate; and we are too big, too powerful, too self-respecting a Nation to interpret with a too strained or refined reading the words of our own promises just because we have power enough to give us leave to read them as we please. The large thing to do is the only thing we can afford to do, a voluntary withdrawal from a position everywhere questioned and misunderstood. We ought to reverse our action without raising the question whether we were right or wrong, and so once more deserve our reputation for generosity and for the redemption of every obligation without quibble or hesitation.

I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

Who would be so cowardly as to stand in the great halls of this the greatest legislative body in the world and say that he would vote in accord with that sentiment and to repeal a law that he knew to be right? Why does not the President come forward and take into his confidence the people whom he represents? Or else why not divulge his secret purpose to the great leaders of the affairs of our Nation? Why does he remain silent when one of the greatest legislative battles known to our history is being waged to maintain not only a law which Congress passed by a majority vote but a principle affecting the sovereignty of our Nation and our right to control our own affairs? It was Lincoln who said—

I stand with those who are right. I stand with them while they are right and leave them when they are wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs disclaims that the repeal of the exemption clause in any wise affects or pertains to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. How does that square with the long, ardent, and patriotic speeches made in both branches of Congress that it does? This view is not shared in by those who voted or the public. How does that declaration coincide with the message of the President which expressly states:

Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal.

It sounds irony and to me like a surrender, and that the honorable Senator from Missouri, as against the President, must be added to the list of the other distinguished and high authorities that we have a right to fix the toll rate of the canal irrespective of any treaty and for the very patent reason given by them. The construction of the treaty claimed by those wanting repeal is unworkable. When the statute fixing rates is repealed, under what law or right will they be fixed, and when?

I wish to put in the RECORD the explanation of the meaning of the Panama Canal treaty which John Hay gave to the Senate in transmitting the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to that body, taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 13, 1914:

The whole theory of the treaty is that the canal is to be an entirely American canal. The enormous cost of constructing it is to be borne by the United States alone. When constructed it is exclusively the prop-

erty of the United States and is to be managed and controlled and defended by it. The United States alone as the sole owner of the canal as a purely American enterprise adopts and prescribes the rules by which the use of the canal shall be regulated and assumes the entire responsibility and burden of enforcing, without the assistance of Great Britain or of any other nation, its absolute neutrality.

Look at the galaxy of great men championing the cause of free tolls.

Our distinguished Speaker, Mr. CLARK, who barely escaped sitting now in the White House [applause], and if he had been nominated would have saved much more than his annual salary in this very contest; besides, he would have sustained the dignity of our Republic; and the great leader of the majority, Mr. UNDERWOOD, takes the position that it is no violation of our treaty. The President himself, in his message, even half concedes that when he calls on us to "repeal the tolls law, whether it be right or wrong." It may be right. Our great Republican leader, Mr. MANN, yielding to no one in his forensic ability and legislative research, voted against repeal. And Secretary Bryan has already shattered the contention of the opponents of exemption by formulating a treaty for Panama, giving Panama the use of our canal in perpetuity for transport of all of its vessels and troops tolls free; and the able Mr. MURDOCK.

Article 19 of the treaty made with the Republic of Panama on November 18, 1903, provides:

The Government of the Republic of Panama shall have the right to transport over the canal its vessels, and its troops and munitions of war in such vessels, at all times, without paying charges of any kind.

This treaty was made after the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and discriminates in favor of Panama.

Add to the above eminent citizens the following distinguished and high authority as being in favor of free tolls—ex-Presidents Taft and Roosevelt, who do not think that we have violated the terms of the treaty by exempting our coastwise vessels.

I want to join in the imprecation by our honorable Speaker, in his great speech here on the floor of this House on this question, and with him, sink or swim, against all comers proclaim the sovereignty of the United States and their right to fix the charges for everything, animate and inanimate, that traverses the Panama Canal, which carries the Stars and Stripes, without the dictation or interference of any other nation on earth, or all the nations on earth.

Why must we divide the ownership of our canal? England has not asked this. No other nation has asked it. If done now, it is as a leap "in the dark." Who knows of any nation asking that we repeal the tolls act, or any portion of it? Let us set the canal to work first, and then see. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARR] such time as he may desire to consume.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration appropriates for invalid and other pensions for the fiscal year 1915 the sum of \$169,000,000. To this amount should be added the sum of \$150,000, the amount appropriated for the fees of examining surgeons. The appropriation last year amounted to \$180,000,000, the amount this year being a reduction of \$11,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, according to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions the number of pensioners on the roll December 31, 1913, was 805,887. This is a decrease of 14,313 since July 1, 1913, a period of six months. The number of Civil War survivors on the roll December 31, 1913, was 448,138. There were on the rolls at the end of the fiscal year 1913 462,379, showing a loss in six months 14,241.

Since 1861 there have been allowed by special acts of Congress 42,337 pensions and increases of pensions, of which 22,016 are now on the roll with an annual face value of \$6,699,096. Only a part of this is chargeable to special acts, as most of the beneficiaries had been previously pensioned under general laws at lower rates. The detailed statement of the apportionment of the pension rolls among the several States and Territories will be found in the report of the Committee on Appropriations. This report shows that the average annual value of each pension is \$209.08 and the average value of the Civil War pension is \$240.69.

The acts of Congress now in operation governing the granting of pensions to soldiers of the Civil War and their dependents are the acts of May 11, 1912, known as the Sherwood Act, and the special acts to which I have referred.

The Commissioner of Pensions states that the maximum number of new applications under the act of May 11, 1912, was attained last year, and beginning with this year the number will decrease. While the loss by reason of death has been very large, there has been no corresponding decrease in the amount of the appropriation for pensions, due to the fact of the increasing value of each pension from year to year. Nearly all the Civil War soldiers are now under the act of May 11, 1912. The report shows that under this act there are 401,792 Civil War soldiers, 13,063 Navy pensioners, and 1,110 Mexican War soldiers on the rolls.

Mr. Chairman, I append the following table showing the total expenditure for pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines, their widows and minor children and dependent relatives on account of military and naval service since the founding of this Government. I think that this total will be found very interesting.

War of the Revolution (estimated)-----	\$70,000,000.00
War of 1812 (service pension)-----	45,923,014.46
Indian wars (service pension)-----	12,241,273.61
War with Mexico (service pension)-----	47,632,572.34
Civil War-----	4,294,596,944.47
War with Spain and Philippine insurrection-----	42,185,230.84
Regular Establishment-----	28,461,369.52
Unclassified-----	16,499,419.44
Total-----	4,557,539,824.68

In addition, Mr. Chairman, to the pensions paid in this country we have 5,495 pensioners who reside abroad, the most of whom are not citizens of this country. The total amount paid to these nonresidents is \$1,166,735.

Mr. Chairman, there are now no pensioners on account of the Revolutionary War on the roll. The last widow pensioner of the war was Esther S. Damon, of Plymouth Union, Vt., who died November 11, 1906, aged 92 years. The last survivor of the Revolution was Daniel F. Bakeman, who died at Freedom, Cattaraugus County, N. Y., April 5, 1869, aged 109 years, 6 months, and 8 days.

The last surviving pensioned soldier of the War of 1812 was Hiram Cronk, of Ava, N. Y., who died May 13, 1905, aged 105 years and 16 days. The names of 199 widows of the War of 1812 remained on the pension roll June 30, 1913.

The committee had under consideration the present method of paying pensions. There was some discussion as to whether it was better to make payment under the certificate and voucher system or the check system. The commissioner stated that the present system of paying by check had worked very satisfactory to the department and to everyone concerned. Under the old voucher or certificate system the pensioner would first get his voucher, which he would have to make out at an expense to himself. That voucher would be sent in to be checked up to ascertain if it were correct. If not correct, it would be sent back for correction and the pensioner would get his check, in any event, from 10 to 15 days after the time when it was actually payable. As the vast majority on the pension rolls are dependent, this delay was a matter of serious consequence to them. Under the check system payments are being made when the pensions are actually due, and the system is so arranged that pensioners living on the Pacific coast receive their checks at practically the same time as those residing in the city of Washington. This new system seems to meet with the approbation of the vast majority of old soldiers, and the department is to be congratulated that this method has been adopted. The only objection that thus far has been urged in this method of payment arises from the fact that under the present law, in the event of a check being lost, the pensioner is required to wait six months before he can be paid. This matter should be remedied, and I suggest to the committee an amendment to the present law permitting the bureau to make this payment as soon as possible after notification that the check has been lost.

Mr. Chairman, there was another matter brought to the attention of the committee at the time the hearings were held concerning the time of payment of these checks. It was suggested that perhaps it would be well to pay these pensions monthly instead of quarterly. The commissioner, who had interviewed quite a number of soldiers at various reunions, was of the opinion that sentiment was so divided upon this subject that the committee did not feel justified in recommending a change in the present law. The committee, as will appear from the hearings, was satisfied that the present method was working with entire satisfaction. It therefore comes with poor grace from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] to charge the Democratic Party with opposition to any change. Mr. Chairman, let me read from the testimony.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CARR. With pleasure.

Mr. WILLIS. What argument was given by anyone against the method of payment of pensions monthly? I will say to the gentleman frankly I have talked with a great many pensioners, and all of them with whom I have talked are strongly in favor of it. I judge from what the gentleman says that some arguments were produced before the committee in reference to that. What were the arguments?

Mr. CARR. I prefer to answer the gentleman's question by reading from the testimony of the Commissioner of Pensions, who appeared before the committee. Mr. DAVIS, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota and a member of the committee, brought to the attention of the committee this question regarding the payment of pensions monthly, and finally the commissioner was asked by Mr. DAVIS:

Mr. DAVIS. There is some agitation of the question of paying pensions monthly instead of quarterly, and that agitation may appear upon the floor of Congress in time. That would necessarily cause some additional expense and would require some additional clerk hire; but, in your opinion as Commissioner of Pensions and as an old soldier, would the additional expense, if any, be overbalanced, so to speak, by the benefits that would accrue to the pensioners if they could receive their pension checks monthly instead of quarterly? I ask your judgment on that as an old soldier and as the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. SALTZGABER. The Commissioner of Pensions is very slow about giving his opinion on proposed legislation, because he believes that it is the duty of the bureau of which he has charge to administer the law, and it is for Congress to determine when pensions shall be granted or paid.

Mr. DAVIS. But Congress usually acts upon information furnished by the bureau.

Mr. SALTZGABER. The monthly payment of pensions was at first favored by me, knowing that some of my old comrades in my immediate neighborhood at home, as I believed, would be benefited by that mode of paying pensions, because whenever they received their pensions for a period of three months, by reason of improvidence or other causes, they soon spent their funds. When they first received their pensions, they would have a period of feasting, and when it came along toward the end of the three months they would have a period of fasting. My notion was that if this money would come along more frequently the situation might be better. Then, I went down to the Ohio State encampment, and, by request, made an address to the comrades gathered there, and in the course of the address I said we were in favor of the monthly payment of pensions, but instantly they began to call out, "No, no; we don't want it." "Well," I said, "I hope you will appreciate the spirit that prompts the suggestion." They said, "Oh, yes; you are all right; but we do not want pensions paid monthly; we want them paid as they are now." Now, I asked the chairman if I could submit the question to those present, and he said, "Yes; go ahead." So I propounded the question to them, and a majority of them voted against it. At Chattanooga I did not discuss the subject with very many, but I understand that the executive council, which is the highest body next to the grand encampment itself—I am referring now to the national encampment held at Chattanooga—that executive council, after consideration of the subject, which was discussed in the address of the commander in chief, unanimously decided against it.

Mr. DAVIS. Decided against monthly payments?

Mr. SALTZGABER. Yes, sir. So I find a very great division of sentiment, and I am unable to determine whether the majority lies on one side or the other.

Mr. DAVIS. It would seem at first glance as though they would prefer monthly payments, just as the ordinary civilian is paid by the month.

Mr. SALTZGABER. So it struck me. I asked Mr. Campbell, at the request of some Congressmen, to make up an estimate of the additional expense that would be involved, and his estimate is that it would require an additional appropriation of at least \$1,000,000 a year.

Mr. BARTLETT. To cover the additional expense?

Mr. SALTZGABER. Yes, sir; to provide the necessary force and equipment to make the monthly payments.

Now, we thought, in view of such information, that the committee was not in a position to make a recommendation one way or the other and that the present method was satisfactory.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CARR. Yes; but I had yielded to Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the gentleman, my colleague on the committee, if he does not think that it would be better to distribute that million dollars to the old soldiers than for it to be expended in such expense? I certainly do.

Mr. CARR. I would answer that, Mr. Chairman, that if the soldiers desire to be paid that way, I should certainly think so.

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly.

Mr. CARR. But until there is some expression of sentiment on the part of the soldiers to have the payments made monthly, I do not see that the committee is in any position to take up this matter and make a recommendation to the Congress.

Mr. DAVIS. But if that million dollars were to be spent, and the soldiers not particularly desiring the money to be paid monthly, I say I would rather give that money to the old soldiers in the way of pensions than to have it go to the expenses of paying monthly.

Mr. CARR. I concur heartily in what the gentleman from Minnesota has said, and I would rather add this additional

million dollars to the pension fund than to have it paid out in unnecessary expenses in sending the money out monthly.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to say I fully concur with the gentleman's statement; I would rather pay the million dollars out to the pensioners by adding it to the amount of pensions than to have it go as clerk hire. I am greatly interested in the information which the gentleman gave of the action of the soldiers, especially at the Ohio encampment and the national encampment at Chattanooga. I did not get from the gentleman's reading and his very lucid statement any expression of the argument as to why they would be opposed to it. What were the arguments given?

Mr. CARR. I do not recall that before our committee there were any arguments given one way or the other, or any argument advanced by the Commissioner of Pensions when he appeared before the soldiers at these reunions; but I take it from what he had stated that the matter had been thoroughly discussed by them and that the arguments that had been advanced were not sufficient to impel a change in the present policy of Congress.

Mr. DAVIS. The council at Chattanooga was unanimously in favor of leaving it as it was?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I was curious to know what the arguments were, because I have received many letters from ex-soldiers and have had personal solicitation from them in favor of the monthly payment of pensions, and it surprises me to find the facts as the gentleman has stated them.

Mr. CARR. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Ohio is anxious, as the members of the committee are, that the very best method be adopted for paying these pensions.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CARR. I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. ADAIR. In view of the fact that it costs the Government less than \$100,000 a year to pay the pensioners of the country four times a year, can the gentleman tell us how the commissioner figures it would cost \$1,000,000 extra to pay them twelve times a year?

Mr. CARR. The commissioner stated in his report that he submitted this question to Mr. Campbell. "I asked Mr. Campbell," he said, "at the request of some Congressman, to make up an estimate of the additional expense that would be involved, and his estimate is that the additional expense involved would be \$1,000,000." Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know, of course, how he arrives at that.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. CARR. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Campbell is the disbursing officer of the Pension Office?

Mr. CARR. Yes; he is the disbursing officer.

Mr. BARTLETT. And an employee of long experience and familiar with his duties.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. CARR. Certainly.

Mr. ADAIR. It occurs to me that a man would not have to be an employee of long experience to know it would not cost a million dollars a year to pay pensioners monthly. Personally, I think it costs too much to pay them monthly. I am not in favor of it, on that account, but I would have to scrutinize the books pretty carefully before anyone could lead me to believe it would cost a million dollars to pay them 12 times a year when it only costs \$100,000 to pay them 4 times a year.

Mr. CARR. Of course, Mr. Campbell is an officer of the Government, and the figures he submits are the best available in ascertaining this cost. Neither am I certain that the statement of the gentleman from Ohio that it costs \$100,000 per year to pay pensions four times a year includes all the cost.

The vast labor necessary to make up a pension roll containing 800,000 names 12 times a year can hardly be realized. Prior to the abolition of pension agencies there were employed 307 permanent clerks, and 162 clerks were employed for 10 days during each quarterly payment period. When the agencies were consolidated with the Pension Bureau the number of clerks were 251. On September 19, 1913, the Comptroller of the Treasury decided that the disbursing clerk for the payment of pensions was the disbursing clerk of the executive department and subject to the provisions of all laws governing disbursing clerks of the executive department. It had been held before that time in the bureau, based upon the decision of the comptroller dated October, 1912, that the disbursing clerk whose fee was provided for in the act of August 17, 1912, was not included within the general provisions of the law with

reference to disbursing clerks of the executive department, but rather that he should be regarded as a pension agent before that time had been regarded. Before the decision of the comptroller the disbursing clerk prepared all vouchers, schedules, and pay rolls and was in possession of all the records of all the former pension agents. After the preparation of the schedules and pay rolls the disbursing clerk certified their correctness to the Commissioner of Pensions. The correctness of the schedules was then certified by the Commissioner of Pensions, and said schedules, with the accounts current, were transmitted to the Auditor for the Interior Department.

Under the present system the pension roll is now in charge of the Finance Division, where are prepared all vouchers or pay rolls or schedules containing the names of the pensioners, the rates of pension, and other essential information, the correctness of which is certified by the Commissioner of Pensions, and the same is placed in the hands of the disbursing clerk as needed for the purpose of pension payments. The disbursing clerk prepares and sends out to all pensioners proper checks, and then makes the necessary notices and certifications of his payments upon the schedules and submits the same and all other papers properly constituting his accounts of pension disbursements to the Finance Division, where the payments are entered upon the roll and the accounts given an administrative examination, after which they are prepared and submitted for the necessary certification and transmission to the Auditor for the Interior Department in accordance with the provision of the acts of July 31, 1894, and August 23, 1912. When the duties of the Disbursing Office was thus changed the number of employees was reduced from 251 to 156.

The Pension Bureau is now one of the busiest of all the departments of the Government. Considering the vast amount of business done, the number of people with whom the bureau is in constant touch, the character and scope of the work, the wonder is that the bureau is able to transact its business with such skill and dispatch as has been evidenced by facts that have come to the knowledge of your committee.

Mr. Chairman, the pension system of the United States commends itself to every American. [Applause.] No Government in this world has treated its soldiers and sailors and their dependents so liberally as this Government has treated its soldiers, sailors, and dependents. We believe that these men who preserved the Nation in time of war are worthy of their country's gratitude. [Applause.] We believe that those who have lost life, limb, or health in the service of the Nation and those dependent should in their own right or that of their legal representatives receive a reward commensurate with the service rendered, so far as the Nation's bounty may be able to measure that service. [Applause.] The pension roll is still "a roll of honor." The nations of the world have recognized the worth of heroic and valiant deeds. They have realized that war is attended with every horror that the human body can experience or the human mind can know. In our own Nation the pension system originated with the Revolutionary War, and the pension policy has been constantly followed since that time. The willing and cheerful spirit with which these appropriations are made by Congress should be a guaranty to every soldier that the Nation which accepted his services in time of its peril has not forgotten him in the days of his adversity. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15280, the pension appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MOTHER'S DAY.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call from the Speaker's table the House joint resolution 263, designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day, and for other purposes, and move to agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama calls from the Speaker's table House joint resolution 263, with Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

O. J. motion of Mr. HEFLIN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to was laid on the table.

BESSIE M'ALISTER M'GUIRK.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I desire to report back the bill (H. R. 4423) for the relief of Bessie McAllister McGuirk, which we think was improperly referred to that committee, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 4423. A bill for the relief of Bessie McAllister McGuirk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOWLER. Will it be proper for me to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the pension bill that is now under discussion? I desire to do so, and ask that the remarks may follow those of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The SPEAKER. What was the last remark?

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the pension bill that is now under consideration, following the speech of Mr. LANGLEY, of Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the first part of it. Of course, the House could locate the place for the speech by vote. The make-up of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is under the control of the Public Printer, and one of the regulations is to the effect that the speeches which are not delivered in the House shall be printed at the end of the RECORD.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois, that he may extend his remarks in the Record? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Now, the gentleman asks that his speech follow the speech of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], made to-day.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to suggest to my friend from Illinois that it seems to me that that request is hardly a proper one. All the rest of us follow the usual rule. Speeches that are not delivered in the House go in at the back of the RECORD. I hope the gentleman will not make that request. I hope he will withdraw it, and thus save me from the necessity of objecting.

Mr. FOWLER. If any Member of this House thinks it unfair, Mr. Speaker, or has any doubt whatever about the propriety of it, certainly I would not request it.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not say it would be unfair, but it is not a proper request. Everybody else who desires to publish an extension of remarks goes into the back of the RECORD, as the Speaker stated.

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I shall not make that request if any gentleman objects.

The SPEAKER. It was never a formal rule, but it was a matter of common consent. The reason that agreement was entered into was that if a debate was going on and A would make a remark and B would make a remark in answer to it and then get leave to extend his remarks and put in his speech, sometimes covering five or six pages, anybody trying to find out what really happened in the House that day would be considerably muddled in regard to it. That was the reason for the agreement. It was a gentleman's agreement.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may not misunderstand me, I desire in my remarks to extend a letter from Secretary of the Interior Fisher in 1911, during the pendency of the Sherwood pension bill in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make that request?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes. If the Speaker thinks I do not have that authority already, I desire to make the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a perfect right to print the letter. The Chair was referring to that part of the gentleman's request to print his speech after the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. FOWLER. I do not make that request.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to do so, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the rules governing the publication of the RECORD, which he will find contained in the back of the RECORD itself. The seventh rule provides—

The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the speeches withheld for revision.

Mr. FOWLER. Of course, it could be done with unanimous consent. I knew that.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] delivered quite a lengthy speech to-day reviewing legislation in the past for pensions to the soldiers and sailors, their widows and minor and helpless children, in this country, the burden of which was intended to convey the idea that the Republican Party always has been and still is the friend of the soldier and sailor, and wedded to a uniform policy of the most liberal pensions for them, and that, on the contrary, the Democratic Party always has been, and still is, the enemy of the soldier and sailor, and committed to a uniform policy of opposition to liberal pensions for them, their widows and helpless and minor children. Had he gone no further than to extol the constancy of his party to the defenders of our national honor, and to a liberal support for pensions for them and those dependent upon them, I should not have engaged in this controversy at all; but when he charges that the Democratic Party is the enemy of these honorable men, and opposed to granting liberal pensions to them and their widows and children, then I think, in justice to all concerned, a reply should be made, so that the real friend to the soldier and liberal pensions for him and his dependents should be made known.

I desire to place in the RECORD some of the laws which were passed by a Democratic House and approved by a Democratic President.

I am indebted to Representative ADAIR, of Indiana, for assembling a large part of the following acts:

First. Act of August 15, 1876, providing for the issuance of artificial limbs, or commutation therefor, to disabled soldiers and seamen, and providing transportation for the purpose of having the same properly fitted.

Second. Act of February 28, 1877, increasing the pension of those who lost both an arm and a leg.

Third. An act of March 9, 1878, granting pensions on account of service in the War of 1812 and the Revolutionary War, requiring a service of but 14 instead of 60 days on the part of the survivors of the War of 1812, and granting pensions to widows, regardless of the date of the marriage to the soldiers of this war. It also granted pensions to widows of soldiers of the Revolutionary War on a service of 14 days. Former laws required a marriage prior to the treaty of peace in the case of widows of the War of 1812.

Fourth. Act of June 17, 1878, increasing to \$72 per month the pensions of those who lost both hands, both feet, or the sight of both eyes incident to the service.

Fifth. Act of March 3, 1879, increasing to \$37.50 all pensions on account of amputation at the hip joint. This sum was afterwards increased to \$45 per month by a Democratic House.

Sixth. Acts of January 25 and March 3, 1879, granting arrears of pensions from the date of discharge, generous measures which benefited more than 225,000 pensioners at once and caused the annual pension rate to leap from \$33,708,526.19 to \$57,240,540.14. The Republican Party had control of both Houses of Congress for more than 10 years after the close of the war, but passed no legislation of this character.

Seventh. Act of June 21, 1879, abolishing biennial medical examinations and providing that in no case shall a pension be withdrawn or reduced except upon notice to the pensioner and a hearing upon sworn testimony.

Eighth. Act of June 16, 1880, giving \$72 per month to all those who became totally helpless for any cause incident to the service.

Ninth. Act of February 26, 1881, for the protection of pensioners in the soldiers' homes.

Tenth. Act of July 4, 1884, which established the proper relation which should exist between attorneys and clients and fixed by law the fees to be allowed in pension cases. By this act a Democratic Congress placed the strong arm of the law between the helpless applicant and the rapacious agent.

Eleventh. Act of July 14, 1892, establishing an intermediate rate of pensions between \$30 and \$72 per month, and fixing the rate of \$50 for all who required frequent and periodical though not regular and constant personal aid and attention.

Twelfth. Act of August 5, 1892, granting pensions to Army nurses and forbidding the demanding of a fee by claim agents for prosecuting this class of cases. This was a generous recognition of the noble heroines who, leaving home and loved ones behind, in self-sacrifice braved pestilence and hardship to minister to the sick in the hospitals of the Army.

Thirteenth. Act of December 21, 1893, making a pension a vested right.

Here are some other contributions to the pension laws which were either approved by a Democratic President or passed by a Democratic House of Representatives:

Fourteenth. Act of April 18, 1884, making it a felony for any person to falsely or fraudulently represent himself to be an officer of the United States.

Fifteenth. Act of March 19, 1886, increasing from \$8 to \$12 per month the pensions of 79,989 widows and dependents on the roll at the time as well as tens of thousands who have since been placed thereon. These certificates were issued by a Democratic Commissioner of Pensions, without any expense or unnecessary delay to those deserving beneficiaries.

Sixteenth. Act of May 17, 1886, amending the reports of the War Department, which discriminated against a large and worthy class of soldiers, relieving thousands of unfortunate veterans of the hardships worked by the resting of the charges against them, based upon technical errors in the records.

Seventeenth. Act of August 4, 1886, increasing the pensions of 10,030 cripples—armless and legless veterans.

Eighteenth. Act of January 29, 1887, benefiting about 30,000 survivors and widows of the Mexican War.

Nineteenth. Act of June 7, 1888, granting arrears to widows from the date of the death of the husband, and providing that all United States officials authorized to administer oaths should administer all oaths required to be made in pension cases in the execution of vouchers for pensions free of charge. This arrearage act benefited at once more than 200,000 soldiers' widows.

Twentieth. Act of August 27, 1888, increasing pensions on account of deafness.

Twenty-first. Act of February 12, 1889, granting an increase of pension from \$72 to \$100 per month to all persons who lost both hands in the service and line of duty.

Twenty-second. Act of March 1, 1889, relating to the payment of pensions to widows or dependent heirs where subsequent to the issue of the check the pensioner dies.

Twenty-third. Act of March 2, 1889, removing certain technical charges in the record and relieving a large and meritorious class of soldiers.

Twenty-fourth. Act of March 2, 1895, which abolished the rate of \$2 and \$4 and fixed the lowest rate of pension at \$6 per month.

Twenty-fifth. Act of May 11, 1912, granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War, increasing the pension of more than 400,000 soldiers, and which is the best pension law ever enacted by Congress, thereby increasing the annual pension roll from \$153,686,500 to \$180,240,145.84.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a magnificent showing for a party which has been in power only 9 years during the last 54 years. It reveals that the Democratic Party has always had the best interest of the soldiers and seamen at heart. It is true that the Republican Party has been instrumental in the passage of some very good laws for the relief of soldiers, but they have always had within their ranks many bitter enemies to the extension of the pension roll. The money power has always fought such extension, and it must be conceded that this factor has had much to do with the pension policy of Republican administrations of the past. I have some evidence which shows to what length Republican administrations have been controlled by the money power, and I desire to place some of it in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, we are told by the public press than Hon. D. I. Murphy, former Commissioner of Pensions, made the following statement:

During the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic at Philadelphia, one year ago, the pension question and the attitude of this administration—

Meaning President McKinley's administration—toward the Civil War veterans was the principal topic under consideration. A special committee, consisting of R. B. Brown, of Ohio, chairman; John W. Burst, of Illinois; John Palmer, of New York; C. C. Adams, of Massachusetts; and H. B. Case, of Tennessee, had been previously appointed to wait upon the President and protest against the policy being carried out in the Pension Office. This committee called on President McKinley on the morning of September 4, 1899. They presented to him the complaints of their comrades and urged a change in the pension policy. They even went so far as to tell the President that the Grand Army of the Republic might even ask for the removal of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Replying to the committee, the President gave them plainly to understand that he would sustain the commissioner, no matter how strongly the encampment might condemn him, and added this astounding declaration: "There is no use denying the fact, gentlemen, that the money power of the country is against any further expansion of the pension roll." The amazement and discomfiture of the committee were so complete that they quickly withdrew from the Executive presence.

The money power—

Says Mr. Murphy—how does it strike the men who left homes and families and staked their all for the perpetuity of the Government? * * * What has become of that Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, that Washington founded and our veterans fought to preserve?

Mr. Speaker, we are told from a clipping from the Associated Press that Secretary of the Treasury Franklin MacVeagh, in an address at the opening session of the American Academy of Political and Social Science at Philadelphia, on the 7th day of April, 1911, used the following language:

We have a perfectly enormous Civil War pension list, which is not a credit to us. It never had a scientific or just basis, although a worthy motive gave it origin. It has lost its patriotic aspect and has become a political list, costing the Government about \$160,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, these clippings tell the true story of disloyalty of the Republican Party to the old soldier in his declining years. The money power furnished the campaign "barrel" for the Republicans, and rather than lose this sweet morsel they decided to dump the old soldiers, their widows, their minor and helpless children, and it was the fights which the Democrats put up in Congress that bore rich fruit for them in the passage of the Sherwood bill. In the Sixty-first Congress, Republican in both Houses and Republican in the White House, with all power over legislation, the Sulloway bill was defeated, and if the Democrats had failed in the elections of 1910 and 1912 I have no doubt but what no new legislation would have been enacted for the relief of the brave men of the sixties. Why try to rob the Democrats of the glory of the passage of the Sherwood bill?

Mr. Speaker, there is record evidence which can not be disputed by anyone, and which will settle the question of loyalty of the Democratic Party to the soldiers and seamen and their dependents. It is a record which Congress has made annually since the Civil War. It is known as the annual appropriation bill for pensions. I invite the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] to this record so that he can compare the appropriations enacted by Republican Congresses with those of Democratic Congresses. When he does this, he will find that during Mr. Cleveland's last administration more money was paid out for pensions than has been paid for that purpose in any administration either before or after his administration, until after the passage of the Sherwood bill. And they will conclusively show that the appropriations for pensions during Mr. Cleveland's administration excel all other administrations in this respect except Mr. Roosevelt's last administration. The appropriations during the three years since the passage of the Sherwood bill falls but little short of the entire appropriations for four years of Mr. Roosevelt's first administration, being only \$420,998.15 short.

It must be admitted that the Sherwood bill as it passed the House was much more liberal than it was after it passed a Republican Senate. Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Fisher, estimated that the increase would reach \$184,000,000 the first year of its operation and \$236,000,000 the second year according to its provisions as it passed the House. But we have seen that the increase fell much short of this sum under the law as it now stands. It was \$180,246,145.84 for the first year and \$180,300,000 for the second year, and for this year it is only \$169,150,000. This reveals that if the bill had become a law as passed by a Democratic House it would have carried an increase of from \$30,000,000 to \$50,000,000, whereas the law as shaped up in a Republican Senate carries an increase of about \$20,000,000, on an average, for the three years. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record the annual appropriations for pensions since 1887, which is as follows:

Total appropriations for 1887	\$76,075,200.00
Total appropriations for 1888 (including all deficiencies)	86,667,500.00
Total appropriation for 1889 (including all deficiencies)	89,758,700.00
Total appropriations for 1890 (including all deficiencies)	107,080,607.35
Total appropriations for 1891 (including all deficiencies)	127,793,059.34
Total appropriations for 1892 (including all deficiencies)	143,189,117.00
Total appropriations for 1893 (including all deficiencies)	160,581,787.35
Total appropriations for 1894	166,531,350.00
Total appropriations for 1895	151,581,570.00
Total appropriations for 1896	141,381,570.00
Total appropriations for 1897	141,328,580.00
Total appropriations for 1898 (including all deficiencies)	149,598,752.46
Total appropriations for 1899 (including all deficiencies)	141,483,830.00
Total appropriations for 1900	145,233,850.00
Total appropriations for 1901	145,245,230.00
Total appropriations for 1902	145,245,230.00
Total appropriations for 1903	139,842,230.00
Total appropriations for 1904 (including all deficiencies)	143,847,600.00
Total appropriations for 1905 (including all deficiencies)	142,860,700.00
Total appropriations for 1906 (including all deficiencies)	141,750,100.00

Total appropriations for 1907 (including all deficiencies)	141,245,500.00
Total appropriations for 1908 (including all deficiencies)	156,143,000.00
Total appropriations for 1909	163,053,000.00
Total appropriations for 1910	160,908,000.00
Total appropriations for 1911 (including all deficiencies)	158,258,000.00
Total appropriations for 1912 (includes \$4,500 in deficiency act for rent of New York agency)	153,686,500.00
Total appropriations for 1913 (including all deficiencies)	180,246,145.84
Total appropriations for 1914	180,100,000.00
Amount in this bill	169,150,000.00

Mr. Speaker, I also insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter which I received from Secretary Fisher during the consideration of the Sherwood pension bill, so that the gentleman from Kentucky can see what a Republican Secretary of the Interior thought of the Sherwood bill, and his opinion as to the increase carried in its provisions. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, December 16, 1911.

Hon. P. J. McCUMBER,
Chairman Committee on Pensions,
United States Senate.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your inquiries of the 11th and 13th instant, relative to the cost of the bill H. R. No. 1, entitled "An act granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico."

The number of pensioners, together with the length of service, present rate of pension, proposed rate per month, annual increase per pensioner, and total increase per annum, as regards the survivors of the Civil War and the War with Mexico, should the proposed bill be enacted into a law, is as follows:

Length of service.	Number of pensioners.	Present rate per month.	Proposed rate per month.	Annual increase per pensioner.	Total increase per annum.
3 months.....	143	\$6	\$15	\$108	\$15,444
	205	8	15	84	17,220
	185	10	15	60	11,100
	20,422	12	15	36	735,192
	702	14	15	12	8,424
6 months.....	124	6	20	168	20,832
	183	8	20	144	26,352
	165	10	20	120	19,800
	18,234	12	20	96	1,750,464
	627	14	20	72	45,144
	8,255	15	20	60	495,300
	180	16	20	48	9,072
	1,908	17	20	36	68,688
9 months.....	206	6	25	228	46,968
	305	8	25	204	62,220
	275	10	25	180	49,500
	30,391	12	25	156	4,740,996
	1,044	14	25	132	137,808
	13,758	15	25	120	1,650,960
	315	16	25	108	34,020
	3,180	17	25	96	305,280
	8,971	20	25	60	538,260
	182	22	25	36	6,552
	3,893	24	25	12	46,716
1 year and over.....	1,169	6	30	288	336,672
	1,732	8	30	264	457,248
	1,564	10	30	240	375,360
	172,621	12	30	216	37,285,136
	5,932	14	30	192	1,158,944
	78,148	15	30	180	14,066,640
	1,787	16	30	168	300,216
	18,063	17	30	156	2,817,828
	182,351	20	30	120	6,282,120
	1,036	22	30	96	99,456
	22,113	24	30	72	1,592,136
	958	25	30	60	57,480
	471,336				75,651,548

¹Includes 1,393 survivors of the War with Mexico.

The total number who would be entitled to the benefits of the proposed bill, based upon the roll as it existed June 30, 1911, is 471,336. The estimated decrease in this number, due to deaths from July 1, 1911, to January 1, 1912, is about 15,000. The average increase per annum per pensioner is \$160.50. This would cause a reduction in the above estimate, due to deaths, of \$2,407,500, leaving the net increase in the value of the roll \$73,244,048.

The following summary shows the number of pensioners on the roll who would be entitled to the respective rates provided in this bill:

Number.	Rate per month.	Amount per annum.
21,657	\$15	\$3,898,290
29,085	20	7,124,400
62,520	25	18,756,000
351,474	30	128,690,640
471,336		158,469,300
Deduct \$336.21 x 15,000		5,043,150
		153,426,150

Average annual value of each pensioner under this act, \$336.21.

It will be observed that the foregoing estimate does not differ materially from that furnished by the department to the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives under date of April 11, 1911. The estimate at that time was based upon a copy of a proposed bill, which did not provide a rate of \$25 per month for those who served nine months and less than one year. The bill as it passed the House makes provision for nine months' service at \$25 per month, and the increased cost due to this provision practically overcomes any reduction which would naturally be expected on account of deaths among the survivors of the Civil War since July 1, 1910.

In the former estimate the pensioners who were receiving less than \$12 per month were omitted because of the small number involved, as were likewise those pensioned at odd rates, such as \$18, \$22, and \$25 per month, for the same reason. However, in order to make this estimate as accurate as possible, it has been thought advisable to include as nearly as practicable all those pensioners on the roll who may have title under this bill. The former estimate did not include the survivors of the War with Mexico, as the bill then under consideration made no provision for that class of pensioners.

The actual cost of the bill for the first year after its passage would depend upon the number of certificates issued. If 200,000 should be issued within the first year, the increase in the disbursements for pension would reach approximately \$32,100,000 and make the total expenditures for pensions amount to about \$184,000,000 for the first year. The maximum cost of this bill would occur in the second year after its enactment, provided the Bureau of Pensions would be able to settle all claims filed under the act in that time. The claims allowed the second year would carry on an average about one year's arrears—the increased rate commencing from the date of filing the application in the Bureau of Pensions. The cost for the second year after the enactment of the bill would very largely exceed that of the first year, being about \$87,000,000, which would make necessary a total appropriation for pensions for that year of probably \$236,000,000. However, the estimates for the third year would show a marked decrease as the arrears carried by the claims adjudicated the second year would no longer appear as a factor. This, in connection with the death rate, would cause a probable reduction in the disbursements for the third year of \$30,000,000.

In the estimated cost of this bill the death rate for the first, second, and third years has been fully taken into consideration.

The enactment of this bill into a law would not, by implication, repeal any existing law or cause a reduction in the rate of any pensioner. In regard to section 2, you are advised that under the act of March 3, 1883, any person who is so disabled by reason of any wound or injury received or disease contracted while in the military or naval service of the United States and in line of duty as to be incapacitated for performing any manual labor, is entitled to a pension of \$30 per month, while under section 2 of H. R. 1 any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor, through causes not due to his own vicious habits, or who, from disease or other causes, incurred in line of duty, resulting in his disability is now unable to perform manual labor, would be entitled to a pension of \$30 per month.

It is a very difficult matter to give any accurate estimate as to the increased cost which would result from the second section of this bill, in view of the fact that each person entitled to the \$30 rate thereunder must have been wounded in battle or line of duty or must have been disabled from some disease or other cause incurred in the line of duty, and be unfit for or unable to perform manual labor. It is not believed, however, that the number of beneficiaries under this section would exceed 15,000. The increase in the disbursements due to this section would probably, therefore, not exceed \$2,500,000 per annum. Before the allowance of a claim under this section it would be necessary to have the applicant examined by an examining surgeon or a board of examining surgeons, and the increased cost due to such medical examinations would probably reach about \$200,000 per annum.

Very respectfully,

WALTER L. FISHER, Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, December 29, 1911.

Hon. H. ROBERT FOWLER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In response to your request of December 26, 1911, I have the honor to inclose herewith a copy of a communication addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, United States Senate, under date of December 16, 1911, relative to the cost of the bill (H. R. 1) entitled "An act granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico."

Very respectfully,

WALTER L. FISHER, Secretary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12291. An act to increase the limit of cost for the extension, remodeling, and improvement of the Pensacola (Fla.) post office and courthouse, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13770. An act to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest and Yosemite National Park, Cal.; and H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in May as Mothers' Day, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, May 9, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. TILACHER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14950) to authorize the city of Louisville, Ky., to open a parkway through the United States fish station and hatchery in Jefferson County, Ky., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 645), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. COADY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12844) for the relief of Spencer Roberts, a member of the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 642), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 262) authorizing the President to detail Lieut. Frederick Mears to service in connection with the proposed Alaskan railroad, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 643), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 236) to authorize the appointment of Clifford H. Tate as a cadet in the United States Military Academy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 644), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 16390) to regulate the hours of labor in continuous working plants of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 16391) to provide for the purchase of a site for customhouse at Galveston, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 16392) to better regulate the serving of licensed officers in the merchant marine of the United States and to promote safety at sea; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 16393) to repair, re-cover, and otherwise improve the public building at New Orleans, La., known as the customhouse; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 16412) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to sell and convey a certain tract of land to the Mardian Town and Country Club; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 264) authorizing the President to accept an invitation to participate in the Sixth International Congress of Chambers of Commerce and Commercial and Industrial Associations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 507) providing for the consideration of H. R. 15503; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 508) providing for the consideration of H. R. 13067; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARNHART: Resolution (H. Res. 510) that the bill (H. R. 15902) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications shall be held and recognized as privileged at evening sessions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution (H. Res. 511) authorizing the printing of 500 copies of volumes 1, 2, and 3 of the Proceedings of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the investigation of shipping combinations; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 16394) granting a pension to Martha Hutchings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16395) granting a pension to Maranda Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 16396) granting a pension to John H. Mathews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 16397) for the relief of S. Arni; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 16398) granting a pension to Frances L. Skillings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16399) granting an increase of pension to Edgar L. Newell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 16400) granting an increase of pension to Walter Haldeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 16401) granting a pension to Walter E. Swett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 16402) granting an increase of pension to Abner R. Bradney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 16403) for the relief of Thomas T. Rideout; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 16404) for the relief of Fanny A. Crocker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16405) for the relief of Samuel Deschamps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 16406) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Lankford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 16407) granting a pension to Louis L. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 16408) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Hutchinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 16409) granting an increase of pension to Reuel A. Hollis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 16410) for the relief of George A. Tarbox; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 16411) for the relief of F. D. Bain; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Socialist Party of the District of Columbia, relative to mining troubles in Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request) memorial of sundry citizens of New York City; New Castle, Pa.; Cloquet, Minn.; McKean, Pa.; Marietta, Ohio; and Verona, Pa., protesting against the practice of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AINEY: Petition of 51 citizens of Warren Center, Pa., and 68 citizens of Laceyville, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association and the Erie Foundrymen's Association, of Erie, Pa., protesting against passage of measures intended to regulate the conduct of interstate business, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Napoleon, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of C. C. Hayden and 30 other members of the Methodist Young People's Society of Wooster, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Edward H. Everett Co., of Newark, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petitions of Aaron Bechtel, J. B. Grace, Joseph R. Mock, D. R. Stayer, M. F. Myers, S. B. Finkle, W. S. Schooley, L. W. Loontz, C. E. Miller, Frank Hoover, H. B. Hoffman, F. B. Hetrick, Chalmers Bechtel, T. M. Meyers, J. B. Myers, J. N. Byers, C. W. Bulger, I. H. Bulger, J. G. Kuch-

baum, D. N. Byers, George Y. Replogle, Amos Johnson, Irvin Stayer, M. D., C. B. Hetrick, J. T. Hetrick, C. R. Streamer, J. N. Smith, William Henry, Jr., R. R. Stayer, Hiram Feltan, all of Woodbury, Pa., for passage of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, (by request), petitions of Jacob D. Brown, Samuel Keagy, Jacob Detwiler, Adam Guyer, E. H. Wyles, George E. Croft, C. C. Ritter, D. J. Reininger, A. C. Negley, J. C. Kensinger, C. E. Little, H. H. Baker, A. B. Hoffman, G. W. Mertzner, Charles Miller, Luther Johnson, L. A. Croft, J. W. Reininger, Herman Clouse, John Ullery, all of Maria, Pa., for the passage of House joint resolution 168 relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Chapter No. 721, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Erie, Pa., relative to antitrust legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of the second congressional district of New Jersey against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of the Ninth United Presbyterian Church, the Chartiers United Presbyterian Church, the Eleventh United Presbyterian Church, the Mount Washington United Presbyterian Church, all of Pittsburgh, Pa.; the United Presbyterian Churches of Woodville, Crafton Heights, Rennerdale, Ingram, Carnegie, and Onkdale; the First Baptist Church and sundry citizens of Homestead, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petitions signed by 102 voters of Ozaukee County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88 and all similar prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the Socialists of Byron County, Okla., protesting against war with Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of a large number of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Manitowoc Malting Co. and sundry citizens of Manitowoc, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., against Johnson amendment to Federal pure-food law (H. R. 9418); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COVINGTON: Petitions of sundry citizens of Rock Hill, 15 citizens of Chestertown, 80 citizens of Crisfield, and 33 citizens of Talbot County, all in the State of Maryland, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Sonoma Wine & Brandy Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., and the Manufacturers and Dealers' League of New York City and State, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEITRICK: Petition of Oscar II Lodge, No. 81, Order of Vasa, of Cambridge, Mass., favoring erection of memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and voters of the State of Massachusetts, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, approving position taken by the President relative to Mexican conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of 966 citizens of Emporia, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Kansas, favoring passage of House bill 11755, relative to Bureau of Farm Loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of the Italian Liquor Dealers' Association, of Ellison, N. J.; the Retail Liquor Dealers' Association; the German Retail Liquor Association of New Jersey; the S. J. Asbell Co., of Paterson, N. J.; and sundry citizens of the seventh congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGLE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Houston, Tex., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of George Staehle, of Philadelphia, and other citizens, protesting against the prohibition amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Racine (Wis.) Suffrage Association favoring equal suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various members of the University Club of Racine, sundry citizens of Baraboo and La Crosse, all in the State of Wisconsin, relative to franchise for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Petition of 25 citizens of Springwood, Va., and 140 citizens of Eagle Rock, Va., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Beverly, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts Board of Trade against House bill 13492 to prohibit the labeling of any goods with any other name than that of the actual manufacturer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts Board of Trade favoring House bill 12292, the Federal child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Young Men's Literary Society of Tacoma Park, D. C., favoring immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of the Massachusetts Liquor League and sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLET: Petitions of various churches representing 280 citizens of Springfield, 90 citizens of Deerfield, 40 citizens of Amherst, 25 citizens of Whately, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 850 citizens of the second congressional district of Massachusetts, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 169 citizens of the second congressional district of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 400 citizens of Springfield, Mass., and 35 citizens of Warwick, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of Local No. 914, Machinists' Helpers, of Hyde Park, Mass., relative to strike conditions in Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, against House bill 13492, the Rogers misbranding bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, favoring House bill 12292, the Federal child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petitions of sundry citizens of the eighth congressional district of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of the Union Fishermen's Cooperative Packing Co., of Astoria, Oreg., relative to House bill 12292, to regulate employment of children; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of the Maine annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Portland, various voters of Lebanon, the Methodist Episcopal Church of West Scarborough, 200 citizens of Wilton, and 100 citizens of Montswey, all in the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petitions of sundry citizens of Rockford, Ill., and Local Unions Nos. 11 and 37, United Mine Workers of America, in Coal City, Ill., relative to strike conditions in Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina: Papers to accompany House bill 16333, granting a pension to Joanna C. Roper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Fairview, Pa., representing 129 persons, and the Salem Methodist Episco-

pal Church, of Pine Township, Allegheny County, Pa., representing 60 persons, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and the Men's Bible Class of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Scottsdale, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of 650 citizens of the third congressional district of Rhode Island against national prohibition; to the committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Burrillville, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petition of sundry citizens of Essex County, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of the First Brethren Church, Men's Bible Class of the First Christian Church, Men's Bible Class of Hagerstown, the Christ Worship Society of the Church of Brethren, the Senior Men's Bible Class of the Church of Brethren, the Sunday School of the Church of Brethren, the Young Men's Bible Class of Hagerstown, and sundry citizens of Hagerstown, all in the State of Maryland, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Young Men's Bible Class of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Eckhart; sundry citizens of Eckhart mines, Garrett County, and Selbysport; the Epworth League of Selbysport; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Carlos; and the Epworth League of Friendsville, all in the State of Maryland, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Erie, Pa., against antitrust legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Chester, Pa., against Government ownership of public utilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of sundry citizens of Plevna, Mo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Polo, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Memorial of the Nebraska Church Federation, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANAHAN: Petitions of churches representing 191 citizens of Madella, 50 citizens of Hinckley, 55 citizens of Lafayette, 115 citizens of Fairmont, 75 citizens of Adrian, 125 citizens of Beaver Creek, 115 citizens of Lake Crystal, 50 citizens of Minneapolis, 75 citizens of Hills, all in the State of Minnesota, and the First District Lodge of the Scandinavian Independent Order of Good Templars, with a membership of 1,200, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of sundry citizens of Byron, Kent County, Mich., protesting against the Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the fifth congressional district of Michigan, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Byron, Kent County, Mich., favoring passage of House bill 12928, retaining section 6; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of the directors of the Deadwood Business Club, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 25 citizens of Oelrichs, 15 citizens of Edgemont, 336 citizens of Hot Springs, and 25 citizens of Caste, all in the State of South Dakota, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of sundry citizens of Madrid, Burke, Gouverneur, Plattsburg, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Richville, all in the State of New York, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL: Petition of sundry citizens and voters of the State of Massachusetts, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 106 citizens of Natick, Mass., and 300 citizens of Waltham, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 476 citizens of Marlboro, Mass., and 92 citizens of Framingham, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Dodgeville, Wis., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Protest of the associate membership of the Knights of the Royal Arch, of San Francisco, Cal., representing the wholesale liquor, brewing, wine, and allied industries, against the Hobson nation-wide prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of Max I. Koshland and 46 other members of the Grain Trades' Association of California, against the passage of the Hobson nation-wide prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the executive committee, representing 52 importers and wholesale liquor merchants of San Francisco, Cal., against the passage of the Hobson nation-wide prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the German-American League of California, representing 30,000 voters, against the Hobson nation-wide prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petitions of sundry citizens of the ninth congressional district of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of various voters of the second congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petitions of 650 citizens of Rhode Island, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petitions of various business men of Palmer, Winchendon, South Ashburnham, Gardner, Baldwinsville, Athol, Orange, Southbridge, and Gilbertville, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED: Petitions of Alfred F. Howard and 998 others, of Portsmouth; W. L. Gibson, of Rye; E. S. Johnson, of Greenland; O. B. Marvin, of New Castle; W. Downing, of Greenland; W. W. Day and J. Reglan, of Exeter; W. I. Haywood, of New Castle; T. M. Weeks, of Greenland; T. W. Weeks, of Greenland; Louis P. Ladd, of Epping; S. L. Reed, of New Castle; John D. Martson, of Rye; W. C. Hansom, of Dover; H. W. Sheppe, of Manchester; Everett Stark, Edward O. Rouke, and George Mansfield, of Newington; R. Grimes, of Dover; Wallace S. Goss, of Rye; W. R. Weeks, of Greenland; J. W. Ernest, of New Castle; E. E. Sterling, of Rye; Fred W. Ray, Jr., of Rye; Charles W. Neal, of New Castle; K. J. Grimes, of Greenland; E. H. Drake, of Rye; Fred L. Morang, of Dover; O. O. Butterfield and John S. Kimball, of Dover; George Meloon, of New Castle; Fred Hudson, of Gonic; D. E. Sullivan, of Dover; F. M. Pickering, C. P. Yeaton, of Dover; C. C. Johnson, J. N. Libbey, J. Manscom, and G. W. Brackett, of Rye; D. Spinney, of Epping; J. N. Tarlton, of Rye; James Blinn, of New Castle; F. P. Towle and William Brewitt, of Hampton; J. Traversy, E. E. Sterling, F. L. Smart, and W. O. Jennis, of Rye; E. E. Chick, of Rye; Winthrop P. Hoyt and 16 others, of Greenland; all in the State of New Hampshire; also George E. Frany, W. C. Chick, and A. Whitham, of Kittery, Me.; Arthur R. Cason, of Sanford, Me.; and D. F. Fanagan, of Lawrence, Mass.; opposing national prohibition of liquor traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of 107 citizens of the third congressional district of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry voters of the third congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 252 citizens of Matawan, 35 citizens of Dunellen, 30 citizens of Freehold, 500 citizens of Highlands, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Lakehurst, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Newark (N. J.) Photo-Engravers' Union favoring the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon bill (H. R. 1873); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHREVE: Petition of 4,100 voters of the twenty-fifth congressional district of Pennsylvania, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of the Congregational Church and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of New Plymouth, Idaho, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society of Longmont, Colo., and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Fruita, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various business men of Greenfield, Shelburne Falls, Charlemon, and Ayre, all in the State of Massa-

chusetts, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, protesting against House bill 13492—Rogers misbranding bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petition of sundry citizens of Rahway, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rockaway and Cranford, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Charlie Eby and Jefferson Swank, both of Findlay, Ohio, protesting against the adoption of House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.